

**THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE
FUTURE**

THE
BALANCE SHEET
OF THE FUTURE

B Y

THE RT. HON. ERNEST BEVIN

MINISTER OF LABOR AND NATIONAL SERVICE,
MEMBER OF THE BRITISH WAR CABINET

NEW YORK

ROBERT M. McBRIDE & COMPANY

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE
COPYRIGHT, 1941, BY
ROBERT M. MC BRIDE & COMPANY
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

FIRST EDITION

◆◆◆ 55

AMERICAN BOOK-STRATFORD PRESS, INC.

FOREWORD

THE method adopted in the presentation of this book is new to me. Those responsible for its production have examined speeches that I have delivered over a period of years and co-ordinated them into themes, and in this way presented the approach that I have made to various economic and political problems.

The very nature of my Trade Union work has compelled the study of international affairs and has caused me to examine the obstacles which were preventing humanity from coming together and establishing a world order.

After considerable study, I have been forced to the conclusion that opportunities must be provided for the people of the world to deal collectively with their common problems. Indeed a better state of civilization and the maintenance of peace really depend upon this.

Another thing that has impressed itself upon my mind has been that the domination of one race by another only intensifies the racial nature of both and the inevitable reaction is the development of a narrow nationalization with an inferiority complex. Equally the domination of one re-

FOREWORD

ligion over another produces intolerance and hate and is the very antithesis of the principles upon which their institutions are based.

I am convinced that the right objective to strive for is political and cultural equality. At the same time with the world so small, from the point of view of communication, and the raw materials of the world entering into every form of civilized life, there must be economic unity and a free flow of exchange.

The task of the statesmen during and at the end of this struggle will be to find a way to promote the defense of civilization and the acceptance of such defense as a social and collective obligation by the citizen who shares in its benefits. There must be the removal of every hindrance to economic unity, thereby securing the use of the great resources of the earth for the prosperity of all humanity.

Economic unity and political and religious freedom are not incompatible.

ERNEST BEVIN.

London,
September, 1941.

BIOGRAPHY,

Mr. Bevin was born in 1881 in Somerset. Started work as a farmhand at the age of eleven, then worked as a shop clerk, street car conductor and carter. Became an official in the Dockers' Union in 1910. Founded the Transport and General Workers' Union, of which he became General Secretary in 1922. Delegate to the International Labor Office at Geneva. Member of the Economic Advisory Council. Chairman of the General Council of Trades Union Congress since 1937. Appointed Minister of Labor and National Service in May, 1940. Member of Parliament (Labor) for Central Wandsworth since 1940.

EDITORIAL NOTE

PART ONE consists of statements made since Mr. Bevin was appointed to his position in the Government; PART TWO of those made before that appointment, during his career as a labor leader and Secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union.

The method followed has been to put together all statements, whatever the occasion or the dates on which they were made, which deal with one subject, or with one aspect of a subject. The sources of these statements will be found in the Appendix.

CONTENTS

Foreword

v

PART ONE

1. The Objective	15
2. The World of the Future	27
3. The Job to Be Done	37
4. Britain's Crisis: Equipping the Forces	53
5. Reorganization of Industry	63
6. Problems of the Home Front	81
7. The Worker and the War	103
8. The Impact of War	119
9. The Rival Philosophies	141
10. Allies and Friends	155
11. Forward, Democracy!	173
12. The Rights of Man	191

CONTENTS

PART Two

13. The Britain I Want to See	203
14. The Commonwealth	217
15. Health in Industry	249
16. Trade Unions and the War	257
17. The Workers' Advocate	281
Sources	297

PART ONE

1

THE OBJECTIVE

THE matter of the domination of one people by another is the issue at stake in this war. No one has ever gained anything spiritually, or in the long run economically, by that process. At the end of the last war we struggled to establish a World Order. We have failed up to now, but sometimes I ask myself, is it a failure or is it a lamentable lesson to the whole of humanity, that sovereignty, domination, and all the things which have prevented a World Order must go by the board, and whether the last twenty years, which have been little more than an armistice, have now brought the world to realize that political and religious freedom, cultural rights and economic unity are not incompatible terms?

It has been argued that the Allies were responsible for all the troubles in Europe, and I must confess that on more than one occasion I was almost driven to the same conclusion, but after making a careful analysis of the period between the two wars—which is a very short period in the history of Mankind—I can find that out of the twenty years between the two wars, seven were spent by Nazi Germany

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

in rearming and re-equipping for the purpose of this war. This must be so or Germany could not, with all her productive capacity, have had the equipment ready for such a struggle as this. If, on the other hand, the period of the last eleven years from the time of the depression of 1930 had been spent in reconstructing the economic life of the world, it would by this time have been a very prosperous place indeed. While there may be bitter controversy as to the part played by English statesmen, yet it is but evidence that no one, either with appeasement, with money, concessions, or anything—whether it came from Russia on the one side, or from us and America on the other—no one could buy off the Prussian Rulers from their determined attempt to use the German people for world domination. Any nation in the position that Germany occupied in 1937 and 1938 could, with a modicum of reason, have obtained from the other nations almost anything within reason. Indeed, the condemnation of our then statesmen was that they were ready to give anything away rather than fight the Germans; and as late as 1939 Hitler received practically all that he desired in food and oil and other commodities for his war machine at the price of peace, from Russia, from Rumania, Bulgaria and other countries. But what does it all prove? That no agreement is sacred to the Germans; it is traditional that no agreement is sacred to the Prussian military caste, except for as long as it serves their purpose, and immediately their purpose is served, there is not even a declaration of war or an ultimatum, or even a notice. As in the case of Russia, with one

THE OBJECTIVE

sudden swoop treaties are broken and they march in to devastate the country and the people.

No peace can be built, nothing can be done until Prussianism is disarmed and the military caste broken. It is impossible for any nation to go to the conference table and attempt to make peace with that type of mentality.

England's experience in the realm of giving liberty is probably the greatest. We have built up a great empire over the last three or four hundred years, but what have we found to give us the greatest security, the unity and the fighting quality to defend it? It is the granting of equality, liberty and the right of self-government, and the response comes from every State in the British Empire to whom it has been given. That, I think, is a reminder to those of us who hold office. A future peace must not be influenced by a couple of hundred M.P.'s in the House of Commons sending a telegram to a Prime Minister at the Peace Conference, as was done at the time of the Versailles discussions. That must not influence us. What must influence us is principle, and I want a lively consciousness this time on the part of the masses of the people whose children always have to pay the price of war.

In the making and shaping of what I hope will be a new era—and I am not talking in empty terms of propaganda—Britain, the British Commonwealth, the United States, or what we know as Western Civilization, cannot survive except upon a basis of liberty and equality among the peoples of the earth, giving to others what you claim for yourselves and getting in return a feeling that there is something to fight and live for. Why has the Russian peasant

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

surprised everybody when compared with the Czar's army? It is easy to understand. It is not the political system that has made him fight. He owns his soil. He is not fighting for a landlord, it is his own; his roots are in it, he owns what he is fighting for. It is not a particular theory of Marx or Engels, or something of that kind. It goes fundamentally deeper, and equally civilization cannot survive if it rests upon a propertyless proletariat. That is why I have urged that if our country is not big enough in acreage to solve our problem by means of the land, as the peasant countries can, as the great territories can, you have to find a substitute, and the substitute is the vested interest of social security within your own State in which all shall participate.

I have said that no agreement is sacred to the Germans; a contrast to the many treaties and agreements signed by Hitler is the recently enacted "Atlantic Charter" signed by President Roosevelt and Mr. Winston Churchill. It is a significant document; I reprint it in full and would draw particular attention to Clauses 4 and 5.

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

"The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have

THE OBJECTIVE

embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

“They have agreed on the following Declaration:

“The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

“**FIRST**, Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

“**SECOND**, They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

“**THIRD**, They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

“**FOURTH**, They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

“**FIFTH**, They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic adjustment and social security;

“**SIXTH**, After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

“**SEVENTH**, Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

“**EIGHTH**, They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.”

It is perfectly obvious that you cannot go on fighting a war of this character unless you set forth what is your objective. No one can see exactly the shape or form of the new development that is going to take place in this world. The planet has become very small from the point of view of communications and travel. We have great aggregations

THE OBJECTIVE

of population, and the problem needs to be studied, but believe me, nobody who lived prior to this war, however great, whether he was a prophet or an economist could have foreseen all the problems that will have to be faced at the next Peace Conference. It is clear that Europe, as we have known it in the centuries past, can never hold the predominant place it has held hitherto. We have had five big wars in a century, and I think the world will have had enough of wars, and most of them have emanated from Europe.

It looks to me—I am not speaking for the Government, because this is purely conjecture—as if those dealing with primary products are going to have a greater say in future world affairs than they have hitherto had. I believe that the British Commonwealth, China, the United States and Russia will probably play a role that no one up to this date has ever conceived in the future organization of the world. I do not believe the world's peace or conflict will rest upon the small nations of Europe as it has hitherto done.

As I said before, one of the striking things in the "Atlantic Charter" deals with raw materials, and I think that what applies to raw materials will apply largely to certain primary foods like wheat. There must be an acceptance that raw materials must no longer be the prerogative of scramble and speculation. There must be organization and control. If I could have my way I would introduce to the raw materials of the world the postage stamp principle. Such things as wheat, rice, rubber, oil, coal, ore, chrome, bauxite and other similar things, I would pool interna-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

tionally, and make an equal charge for their use to anybody who needed them. The standard of life and the peace of the world depend so much upon them as also does the stability of the world. I am convinced that this step would remove to a very large extent some of the prime causes of this international struggle. It could not hurt anyone; indeed it would be a great benefit to all, for it is in manufacture, in the genius of production, in the skilled manipulation and scientific use of these things, and the application of the higher degrees of intelligence that the different nations bring to bear, that will determine the final product and its cost. I only hope that the Declaration regarding free access does not merely mean free access, but the working out of a system whereby these great basic materials may be free to mankind in equal terms.

The other great factor in the "Charter" is International Labor. Labor from the raw material to the finished goods must represent in one form or another nearly 80% of its cost. It is bound to do so. What greater contribution could be made to world stability and the wiping out of international competition than the building up of economic standards throughout the world? I hope we shall not have another International Labor Office merely debating wages and hours; but one that, having debated them, can go on and debate and exchange views and make recommendations as to the steps to be taken to give economic effect to our decisions in order that the results may flow to the peoples of the world. What has any nation to worry about in another nation raising its standard of living? Why do people buy sweated goods? Because they cannot afford to buy the best.

THE OBJECTIVE

You will find a bigger purchase of sweated goods every time poverty increases. Our women folk have as good a taste as anybody in the world; the only thing what stops them satisfying it is their standard of life. We have undergone a great change in social status. The requirements of social life, housing, all these kinds of things have contributed to this great difference. I am satisfied that there must be a real drive toward international standards of labor; not in the bargaining sense but in the objective one. Gold can no longer give us international stability; we shall be right back where we were with another world war if we rely upon it; these other things have got to be brought into the picture, together with the exchange of scientific knowledge, trade, etc.

The whole drive at the end of this great struggle must be toward raising the standard of life, raising civilization, spreading it, creating desires and then satisfying them. That is the way to create trade markets; not struggling to share miserable little standards of the back streets, but creating markets. I believe we shall be forced to that position as a result of our poverty at the end of this war. We shall all be broke and probably that will not be a bad thing. May we not, in the centuries that have gone, have developed so much wealth that we have really been struggling to protect it rather than to create new wealth? In this war the great creative brains of our people have been let loose. May it not be that out of the vortex of this terrible struggle, the creative genius of our people will be let loose, and may not there be a great renaissance resulting in a new Britain, freed from the snobbery at one end and the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

poverty at the other, and that the birth of a higher and nobler civilization may be a compensation for the horrible struggle, the nightmare and the bitterness and loss of life that Hitler has imposed upon us?

British Labor would not fight an imperialist war. Mussolini began the game of destroying trade unions, then he made Austria do the same. Hitler followed suit and smashed unions in each invaded country and then marked us down for destruction in turn. But we are not going down.

We have had our bitter struggles but we still believe that the ultimate emancipation of the people depends on their right to work out their own destiny, step by step. Working people can never rise to their full stature under a system dependent upon autocracy or dictatorship. They must win it through a labor movement organized and united under a free democratic system. Labor's aims are similar the world over. We all have our national characteristics but a great force unites us. The trade unions cut right across the factors that divide humanity; they unite all peoples irrespective of race, color or religion.

Therefore I put this challenge to all my fellow workers in America: Can you leave one section of the great working classes to fight this battle alone? You know in your hearts that your future also depends upon a victory over Nazism. It is acknowledged that that victory depends on overwhelming supplies of all forms of war material. Surely the working people will not allow any disunity in their own ranks to hinder final victory over this monster

THE OBJECTIVE

who would destroy them. There must be united effort, mutual sacrifice and unremitting production if we are to share in victory and then join in the great task of world reconstruction.

2

THE WORLD OF THE FUTURE

THINGS can never be as they were. The old age has passed; the new had to be built, and what greater tribute can we pay to those who are suffering at the moment than to be able to say to them: "This time it is really not in vain." The furnaces of war are heating the molten metal; citizens and statesmen must shape it. The form it will take depends on how it is handled now, and under the very din of battle our aims and energies must be directed to the common good. We must grasp now all the social implications of this great struggle. I believe there is in the minds of the people a desire for change. We have contributed to political freedom and we must apply the same kind of ability if we are to make in our generation the greatest contribution the world has ever known to the solution of the economic ills that have caused so much disaster and disappointment in the past.

My war aim is summed up in the phrase, "the motive of our life must be social security." Why do I urge it? I am thinking of the suffering, teeming millions in Europe and other

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

parts of the world who, for the sake of freedom, want us to be victorious, but who are asking what is to be our attitude after. You have got to create a feeling of hope, a new and better economic outlook—and example is better than precept. If here, in the old country, we are beginning to shape a new conception, to forge it and to weave it into our own economic life, and doing this at a time when the struggle is going on, is that not something which will create confidence and provide a real answer to Hitler? He has solved unemployment by making weapons of destruction. What is the only effective answer to the doctrine of his new Europe but a demonstration by us that an economic order based upon construction, peace and security is being inaugurated?

I call, then, for such use of mental equipment, skill and outlook as will provide the solution to the economic problem of our time. Talk of national unity will be an empty phrase unless that national unity is directed to the achievement of a great objective. You can spend millions of money now on the weapons of destruction; then may I not ask that the great creative brain of the scientists, the factory manager—the great managerial brain of industry—the ability of the operative, be directed to this great objective? And when your balance sheet of the future is drawn it will show how much has been contributed in organization and production to prevent unemployment; what they have added to the social landscape; what was devoted to the health of the people and what was accomplished in raising the whole standard of living in this old country—and, indeed, the world.

THE WORLD OF THE FUTURE

Cannot you, in addition, see being beaten out on the anvil by the hammer of events, new developments—not being left to wait for the conference table after the war, but taking shape in the actual progress of the war?

Does not the collaboration between Australia, Canada and the United States, the leasing of bases to the United States and the weaving together of our vital interests, represent the bringing together of great democracies that have hitherto stood apart and have often diverged? Is not the common defense of civilization producing under our very eyes what represents a revolution in thought and outlook? Does not the gallant defense of China against the aggression of Japan—the withstanding, for three years now, by a peasant population, ill-supported, yet full of courage, of a most terrible onslaught from an aggressor—represent the birth of a new age of the oldest race, of the greatest historic culture and the most marvelous civilization in the world?

We are gaining a great experience which can be of vital use in peace, and we are determined that such experience as we gain shall not be thrown away but shall be used in the development of the new Britain we want to see. Immediately a nation is involved in a great crisis of this character it has to act collectively, it is bound to become collectivist, and that brings into play great social forces. Individualism is bound to give place to social action; competition and scramble to order; and the rule of law has to be applied in the place of anarchy.

There will be a quite different situation at the end of this war compared with that at the end of the last one.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

Then it seemed to be the mood of the nation to capitalize the results of war. It took the form of wild flotations, dissipation of reserves and, ultimately, disaster to many great businesses and undertakings. Millions of people, as a result of the propaganda then in vogue, poured the results of their war savings and their bonuses and their earnings into many of these wild flotations, only to find that all was lost and no national purpose had been served. The industrial revolution of the 19th century brought accumulated wealth, denuded our countryside, built for us the congested cities and slums. The new industrial revolution that must follow this war must work directly opposite. It will create wealth, and I believe that the genius of our people is equal to creating even greater wealth, of the real kind, than has hitherto been known—but it will be the use of wealth that will be the primary purpose of the revolutionary change that must take place. Its task will be the wiping out of the slums, the preservation of the countryside, the establishment of a correct equilibrium between town and country, the development of great public services, the breaking down of barriers between nations, the freer movement of the people over the face of the earth, opportunity for travel and a broadened basis for our whole national life.

This war is forging us into a common humanity in which neither position, privilege nor anything else will determine rank. You have witnessed how this is being shaped into our legislation. Did you notice the significance of that great Act for Mutual Insurance against War Damage we have introduced? It represents a common acceptance of liability throughout the whole community, not merely for property

THE WORLD OF THE FUTURE

but for effects. And do you notice that in the Scheme of Compensation for Civilian Injuries, under which we compensate for injury or for death, everyone is placed in exactly the same relation to the State? It is significant how this very war is forging this new conception of relationship to the State on the basis of equality.

Social services are being maintained. We are not being obsessed entirely by the struggle that is going on. We are maintaining a determination to win and to achieve victory, but we are not forgetting the opportunities that this struggle and this new kind of character that is being forged will present to assist us in the great task of rebuilding a new civilization. International labor, international economies and international commonwealth will have new meanings at the end of this war. People will be less concerned about mere sovereignty but rather about free political institutions, economic advancement and the standard of living.

I believe the next war after this one will be declared not between races, not between nations, but on poverty, on ignorance and on all kinds of things that have led humanity into political complications and the wrong kinds of war. No, we are not allowing even the grimness of the struggle to blind our vision to future possibilities.

I want to give you a new motive for industry, for life.

I suggest that at the end of this war, and indeed during the war, we accept social security as the main motive of all our national life. Begin there. That does not mean all surpluses would be wiped out, but it would determine how they would be used; it does mean that the whole of your economy—finance, organization, science, everything—is

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

directed to give social security, not to a small middle class or those who may be the possessors of property, but to the community as a whole.

I went into an Employment Exchange the other day, a new one opened in 1938. It occurred to me as I went through that building that it had been designed by the Governments representing us, and I found the most meager provision in the building was for placing into employment, and the largest place was for paying out relief.

I want to see that entirely reversed. Why must we reverse it? You have got to do that or you have got to stop the whole educational system. You cannot go on teaching and not satisfy; you only intensify suffering. Better leave the masses untaught than give them a double appetite both of stomach and head and then not satisfy either. I am afraid that at the end of this war, you may well slip into the most revolutionary action unless the community is seized with the importance of this. I do not mind a revolution if it is well directed and is to achieve a great purpose, but what I am horrified at is blind revolution of starving men, undirected, with no objective—that spells disaster for the whole country.

You will have at the end of this struggle men demobilized from the Forces, men taken from industry. Tremendous readjustments will have to be made, and you will not solve it this time by putting a few shillings on the dole for a short period and tiding over by inflating your money for a few years and then crashing down as you did after the last war. The very training of your airmen today, and those in the other Forces—remember it is a mechanized Army—

THE WORLD OF THE FUTURE

is producing an outlook and mentality that will never submit to the neglect that the untutored masses of the past had to undergo. Therefore, I urge every citizen to direct his mind not to tiding over an immediate difficulty but to the laying of a new foundation for society now.

That involves intense development of our resources. Surely we can no longer stand great combines restricting production and enterprise because of their capital investment and profits? I do not mind a well-rationalized industry or a well-organized business, but we cannot have finance as its dominant consideration: it must be service, and its only right to exist must be that it serves a great social purpose. As an example, had our great basic industry, coal, been run on sound principles, and research been applied to it, what great supplies could have been available now of materials we could have put to good use for national purposes! Indeed, we could have had available substitutes with which to rebuild our houses that have been knocked down by the enemy; we could have reduced the risks suffered by our sailors who have now to sail the seas with the timber and with the many other commodities needed for construction. All this would have been possible if great vested interests had not hindered and held back many great developments, preventing Nature from yielding her resources and the scientists and skilled workmen from molding them for the use of mankind at a time when they were required for human developments. This is an important social implication.

Who has any hope of gain out of this war? I told a group of employers at the Business Club that they would all be

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

broke any way—I indicated that they would all be comrades, friends, at the end of the war. I told them that because, if they make a profit, we are bound to take it from them in Income Tax. There can be no spectacular victory, no glory; there will be nothing of that. What matters is the saving of our souls and respect. From the British people right throughout the Commonwealths and people in other parts of the world we want a great spiritual urge that says, "No one shall impose a finality upon the progress of the human mind." No oligarchy that may be created or maintained by a military regime shall succeed in that.

No one has a right to be better off out of this war. It is a human struggle as to which form of government is to survive. Are we to be governed from the top; are we to be ruled by an oligarchy; are we going to let men be ruled by beasts without rhyme or reason; or are we to have responsible government dependent for its existence on the people? Are the people to be masters of their own destinies, of life and death, or are people to be organized according to the likes of dictators? That is the issue. Out of it will come a new world. War is a supreme test of democracy.

We know that at this time in our history we are not merely fighting a state, we are fighting a philosophy. We are up against a set of principles upon which will be determined whether the government of the world of the future is to be dominated from the top or whether it is to be responsible to the people and to the governed. I think it would have been better if the issue had been settled finally twenty years ago—it would have been better had the fundamental principle as to what was at stake been understood—but it

THE WORLD OF THE FUTURE

is no use complaining. We do not misunderstand, now. It is a fact that the issue is clear—there can be no peace by maneuver of any kind until one or other of these principles is accepted. I believe that we shall win—and in winning we shall construct a world based on a foundation of real responsibility of self-government; and that means that the issue of war and peace, the issue of life and death, is vested in the people and cannot be wrested away either by those who rule or by a military oligarchy or any other form or device. Anything else would only mean that our successors would have to go through this tragedy again in a very short time; and in the task that we have before us at the moment we are not fighting for this generation—we are fighting for the generations yet unborn, that they shall not be condemned to a constant recurring threat of war and threats to civilization.

I have faith in democracy and its ability to carry us through. I believe it is the right form of government. The freedom to evolve that it gives enables mankind to reach a greater status. I do not believe there is any finality to the progress of the human kind. That is why I cannot accept dictatorship.

I do not want to have to worship a man or a system. I prefer the words of the poet: “God, give us no more giants; raise, elevate the people.”

3

THE JOB TO BE DONE

I AM glad that I can speak for the millions of my fellow Trade Unionists in the United Kingdom who, on May 25, 1940, discussed with me in a most inspiring conference and determined manner the detailed plans for the utilization of the services of the fifteen million working population in these islands. At the end of that discussion they adopted a stern resolution pledging themselves to support their own General Council and the Government in organizing the entire resources of the country and using the utmost endeavor to defeat the forces of aggression. They did so in the fullest assurance of the General Council's determination "to preserve the powers and functions of the trade unions and to insure the maintenance of the hard-won liberties of the workers."

Such a conference of responsible executives of over two hundred Trade Unions and Federations was a great inspiration to those of us who had decided to take a responsible part in the Government of the country. As I addressed them I saw on the faces of all my comrades a grim resolve and an iron determination. This is what I said:

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

“At this moment France is ravaged; Belgium is nearly conquered; Holland is conquered; Norway, second only to us as the home of trade unionism, is destroyed; and the enemy is at our gates. It is with that position before us that I have to make to you this morning suggestions of the way in which at this moment in an organized, methodical, and I hope voluntary disciplined manner, the British Trade Union Movement can demonstrate to the world that it is in fact the savior of democracy.

“Before, however, proceeding with my statement, I have been asked by the Prime Minister to read this letter to the delegates:

“ ‘Dear Mr. Bevin:

“ I shall be glad if you will give to the Conference of Trade Union Executives the assurance of my deep and active interest in the purpose of their assembly and let them know how much I should have welcomed, under conditions of less urgency and pressure of manifold dangers, an opportunity to speak to them personally.

“ The Conference, I am sure, will appreciate the nature of the responsibility which falls upon you, as Minister of State in this severe crisis of our fortunes, in explaining to the unions the necessity which has caused Parliament to enact the new emergency legislation, and how the Government plans to use this exceptional power for the prompt and complete organization of the country’s industrial resources to help us to meet the imminent perils that face us. The country’s needs are imperative, inescapable and imperious, and we shall pay dearly if we fail to meet them.

THE JOB TO BE DONE

We can meet them now as a Government founded upon a new unity of national purpose, and with the creative energies of a people awakened to the magnitude of the task. We have the fullest confidence in the readiness of the organized workers to accept the obligations arising out of the demands which the State is compelled to make upon their endurance and their capacity for sacrifice. We look with equal confidence to the Trade Union Executives called into conference by their General Council to assist the State by using their widespread organization to serve the purpose you will unfold at the Conference. The gravity of the situation deepens hour by hour, and we are all called upon to make a supreme effort to defend the country, to preserve our liberties, and to win the war. Trade Unionists, with their tradition of sacrifice in the service of freedom, will not hesitate to throw their full strength into the struggle.

“ ‘Yours sincerely,

“ ‘Winston Churchill.’

“I little dreamed that I would be called upon to undertake what I suppose is one of the most onerous duties in the Government. While other departments may handle raw materials and organize production, every one of you who holds a responsible position in our unions knows how difficult it is to handle the human being. He is the most awkward part of production unless you handle him right.

“The thing that impressed itself upon me when I entered the Ministry was the lack of organization of the State’s man power. Here let me say this is not the fault of the staff or of the department, because I am going to say at the outset

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

that while I have had to try to construct one of the biggest industrial machines, covering nearly 13,000,000 people, inside of a fortnight, I have had a staff the like of which I have never met in my life. There has been a lot of nonsense talked about the Civil Service. I have had experience of the Civil Service this last fortnight from the humblest clerk to the Permanent Secretary. I have called for hours of labor, thought, energy, and creative work; and the moment I have come to a decision (and I find that is what the Civil Service wants—decision), they will do the job. The moment I came to a decision the train of activity was put in motion at once, and I have been amazed at the way in which they have clothed the bones, so to speak, of anything I have attempted to create. I am not going to indulge, and this is not the time to indulge, in the holding of inquests on anything that has happened. We will wait until victory is assured. I found that with regard to the organization of the man power of the State—and I emphasize the word ‘organization’ in its fullest sense—there was not very much in existence. I felt that it was no good attempting to try to handle the labor side of the problem unless there was quickly brought into existence a machine which would allow all the other functions of production to work in cohesion. Nothing is worse than to be calling upon men to do something, and find the raw materials and tools are not there to do it. Neither is it right to be moving about the country calling for dilution, calling for women, calling for all these services, unless the rest of your productive machine harmonizes and moves together.

“I therefore immediately examined the problem on the

THE JOB TO BE DONE

first day. You will appreciate one had to move quickly. I went in at two-thirty on the afternoon of Tuesday; and on Wednesday morning at eleven o'clock I produced at least the outline of the basis of my scheme. Then at three o'clock the staff gathered round me and examined it in all its details; and by Friday night we had circulated it to the rest of the Departments. I could not move much faster than that. But it was a big task. The first thing I had to do was to get the War Cabinet to agree to the principle of taking industry over or controlling it. You cannot in the middle of a war, with the enemy at your gates, be too nice as to the methods that you have to adopt, or sit down and work out with meticulous and mathematical precision exactly how you are going to do this, or exactly how you are going to do that. But I felt it would be unfair and unwise, and psychologically wrong, to ask me to appeal to the workmen to give a bigger output unless at the same time they immediately agreed to the policy that no other citizen could profit as a result of that increased output.

"You will have noticed that on Monday the Order in Council is to be issued. We shall move as fast as we can consistently with resisting the enemy, because you have to remember these two things have to go on at the same time. We cannot stop for a lot of negotiations. Hitler decides the speed—we do not; except that our speed must be faster than his. The thing that impressed me when I considered this problem was not whether we could do it, but whether things had gone so far that there was time to do it. This is the great anxiety that I have had the whole of these last ten days.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

"The second point was that I felt there must be a Production Council, and that Council must be in possession of the strategy of the war. You could not have Departments like the Army and the Air Force ordering this and ordering that and ordering something else, and expect me to supply labor to the whim of every command and the idiosyncrasy of every general, whether there were materials or whether there were not. And so the War Cabinet agreed that this Production Council should be established. And it will be their duty to survey consistently the raw materials of the country, the most urgent production, and the swinging of production from one form to another according to the vagaries of the war. And we ask our people in the workshops to accept our decisions, if they will, as to which is the most urgent, when we cannot always tell you at the time.

"Then the next step I had to consider was as to what form of organization I could create in the Ministry for which I was responsible. I came to the conclusion that I must establish a central pivot over which I shall preside myself. It will be called the Labor Supply Board. That Board will survey the use of labor.

"This is important. I do not want to go mad on dilution for dilution's sake. There is not time. I must utilize the skill I have got, and the facilities I have got, to the utmost capacity immediately. If we resist the enemy successfully now, and there is further time, and the war then reverts back to a long-term war—and it may well do, one cannot tell—then the other side of training for production will have to be considered. But for the moment we have to try to utilize every bit of available skill that we have got, and

THE JOB TO BE DONE

every available bit of machine tools and equipment. Machine tools today are more precious than all the banks of England. The skill of our men is the wealth of our country and our defense, together with the bravery of our troops and the other forces fighting with us.

"There will be four men who will form the Labor Supply Board and survey for me the use of labor and the transfer of labor, and before any regulations are made or there is any movement of labor they will satisfy themselves that the other Departments are not acting on any freak claims, but that labor in the district is utilized.

"The War Cabinet has, in addition, imposed upon me by the new Bill the duty of dealing with all labor, including mines, agriculture and the Mercantile Marine.

"With regard to the mines, they gave me power to delegate my responsibility, and I have already met our old colleague, David Grenfell, and with him I am trying to work out a scheme in which I shall agree with him the total labor force required for the mines; we are going to try to bring men back by removing other restrictions arising out of previous Acts and various other things, and, if it is possible by a system of temporary training of men who have been kept out of the mines a long time but are still living in the district, give them a chance to come back and give me their skill to carry over this difficult period. I came to the conclusion, having established this labor force for mining, that it should be handed over to the Mineworkers' Federation and the Mines Department to discipline it and handle it on my behalf. The reason why I am very anxious to exercise very great care in the mining situation is this: I do not want

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

by any stupid action in forcing too many men back into the mining districts to create the position that we had previously. And here I appeal to the Mineworkers' Federation, and say it may be better for them for the future to extend their hours and their production temporarily rather than create derelict areas again after the war. I do not want to force people back and then have them stranded again in the situation that we had on the last occasion.

"With regard to agriculture, I have told the Government that before I can make any Order a proper equilibrium must be established, not between town and country exactly, but in what I will call rural England. In other words, this difference between public employees and those in factories and the people in rural England itself must be obliterated, and the old conception that agriculture is an industry of servitude must go, and go for all time. I hope not only to make a contribution to produce the necessary food, but I hope to remove a grievance which, as a country lad myself, has always burned in my bones. I am happy, as one who was born on a farm, to be given the opportunity to wipe that blot out of our industrial life.

"Then in the localities I have made the divisional controllers of the Labor Exchange the responsible divisional supervisors of the whole scheme. They will take over immediately the Ministry Supply Committees which were set up with the Trades Union Congress and have not been given much to do. I hope they will have plenty to do now. But the key point of the scheme is the local bodies themselves. I know the differences that exist. I know the difference in the attitude of mind in the different parts of the country, and

THE JOB TO BE DONE

therefore I brought it down to the local district, and there the Labor Exchange manager will be my chairman.

“There is the question of the relaxation of the Factory Acts. The present method is clumsy and unsatisfactory. You never know whether an employer is pulling your leg or not. Before he can relax or send his case for relaxation on to the Home Office for relaxation, it will be the duty of this Sub-Committee to investigate the facts and to send their recommendation along. They will know whether the factory is suitable, whether there is other labor in the district, and where the labor can be got. All these considerations will come in before there is any relaxation of a single rule.

“Then they will have the problem of welfare, and this is very vital. If this war goes on I shall have to call upon thousands of women to come into industry. These women have homes, and when a woman has worked in a factory all day long, cleaning the house is a problem, and I have to relieve her. I am therefore sending instructions to the local authorities through the Ministry of Health to survey the whole of the billeting arrangements in the munition centers. I believe we can get a much better result if we can provide lodging accommodation—so that the woman in the home is not called upon to cook and do all the other things as well—if it is purely a question of sleeping, and a cup of tea or something of that kind. I therefore propose to ask the local committees to examine the feeding arrangements. If necessary, I am prepared to take works canteens, not only for the people in the works but for people in other works, to use the great canteen accommodation and to establish new canteens in the districts where the people are

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

lodged, in order that they can have communal feeding and food cooked under proper conditions.

“Then I want them to undertake a survey of the training facilities in their district. The reason I want that is this: I do not want thousands of people trained, and then disappointed. They will know the local labor supply, and they will know, too, if we get air raids and works get knocked out, how to plant the men in other parts, and all the rest of it, and how to supplement them. The facts will be before them. They will be my local Cabinet.

“One of their duties in training will be to divide the matter into four categories. One is the works itself. I do not want people taken into a works pretending to be trained. They must be trained if taken into the works. They must not be wasted.

“Second, I want them to survey the works that will have, of necessity, by reason of their task, to go out of business; that is to say, because commercial business has had to slacken down. I cannot use the plant for commercial business, but I can probably use the plant for training purposes.

“In addition, I want them to look around the whole of the maintenance staffs. Many of the maintenance staffs have a very fine body of general engineers who can do anything. I want to use the maintenance staff shops, many of which are running only eight hours, to achieve two objects: first, to accustom a person, if only in a preliminary way, with the use of machinery; and second, I want the engineers in the shop, or, as the case may be, skilled men in any of the crafts, to be my instructors so that I may achieve the double purpose.

THE JOB TO BE DONE

"Then, as I say, there is the question of the supply of women and semiskilled labor. I have thrown open today the Ministry of Labor training centers to people other than the unemployed. And here I want to emphasize this point. I want the Branch Secretaries who have got semiskilled men who ought to be promoted but need finishing off in any scheme of training, to arrange with the Local Committees to give them a short time at a training center in order that they can go up, and I shall not have the complaint of people from outside being brought in trained and put over their heads. That is very vital, because the semiskilled man can be made proficient in a very short time.

"My last point with regard to the training business is this: One of the weaknesses I find in production is in the higher grades of supervisors. Judging from some of the reports I have received, there is very grave doubt as to the ability of some of the people who have been appointed as progress supervisors and people of that kind. I am casting no reflection, but I have an impression, and I must forget what I knew before I was Minister of Labor in that respect, though not in anything else. I propose to impress both demonstration rooms and technical colleges in order that some of my own people who know the job can have the facility to get training quickly to full efficiency, I hope, within the higher branches of industry. I then propose to appoint anything up to 400 Labor Supply Inspectors, and their duty will be to enter the shops to see that labor is not wasted, and to see that nothing happens such as happened in the last war when skilled men were held back to stop the plant next door using them; because I must use the skilled men

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

to the maximum capacity or I am forced to too great a dilution. That is the issue that is before me.

“Then I propose, in order to cater for the mobility of labor, to arrange a transfer scheme through the local bodies and the divisional controllers, first utilizing the grouping in a limited area. For instance, to illustrate my point, the other night I was approached and told that work was held up for want of fitters in the Rolls Royce plant at Crewe. I found that a lot of argument had been going round on this, and I got on the telephone with the Railway Executive and the Unions and in less than half an hour the requisite number of fitters was transferred from the L. M. S. Railway to Rolls Royce, and a whole chain of production was released in a few minutes in consequence.

“With the Production Council in being, if you take a place like Derby, I can say, ‘Can you slow down on railway work for a week or a few days, and let me release the block that has arisen in one of the other works in the district?’ and in that way I can avoid the disturbance of the people’s homes and all this traveling about the country which is so silly. In air attack of this kind I have to have regard to the fact that I have the women and the children to look after who are subconsciously going through a very nervous strain the whole time; and the less disturbance I can create the better I shall be pleased.

“But I shall have to move people; it may be I shall have to move miners if a mine gets blown up, or it may be I shall have to move aircraft people, or it may be I shall have to move people in order to increase the production here or there due to the strategy of the war. This presents a very

THE JOB TO BE DONE

difficult problem, and I have decided that I will pay a lodging allowance in every case where a man can show that he is keeping two homes. That is to say, if a man has a home to keep and then is removed to another job which involves him in the cost of lodgings, I would pay the lodging allowance. But in the case of single men or men with no liability of that sort, where it is just a case of putting your hat on and leaving your lodgings and going to another town, I am not prepared to undertake to pay a lodging allowance, and I do not think you would ask me to do it. I pay this lodging allowance in order not to upset the wage arrangement. And in order that there shall be no percentage charged on it anywhere, I propose to pay the lodging allowance through the Employment Exchange so that it is only the lodging allowance I pay and nothing more. I think you will agree that this is better finance than the spiral.

"I have had a great worry. I knew I had to come and ask you to break your rules, and work overtime. Here let me say in passing that the nation and the boys at the front are indebted to you for what you have done. We have not removed all the bottle-necks yet, but I can assure you the most drastic action is being taken to remove any hindrance as fast as we can, and if we find a management or a director or somebody else with their funny little ways standing in the way of turning the stuff out, I feel happy now—as you will realize—that I can assist in sacking the boss. Many a time I have felt like it. Therefore, if there is anything standing in the way, be sure to let us know. You ought to do all you can to see there is no hindrance put in the way of production.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

“But I was worried as to how I could see it all restored. The one way and the only way I could think of effectively doing that was to add a clause to the Fair Wage Resolution permanently, under which no person either serving the Government or in a Government factory or contracting for the Government shall be entitled to a single order where the Trade Unions can show their position is not properly restored. I emphasize that point. I told the employers that my colleagues would agree quite frankly that if the Trade Unions gave anything up, they and they alone were the people to say it should be restored, and it was not a question of argument afterwards. I said: ‘You will settle your problem of compensation with the Treasury. You will settle your problem of management. That is your business. But what I am asking is that if the workman has to give up something that is his, he is the man to determine that it shall be given back.’ I stand on that four-square, and so does the whole Government. You are entitled to ask us for that. I could not think of a better device than framing a Fair Wage Clause, because at the end of this war I am convinced, even when we are victorious—which in spite of the black hour, we are going to be—when aggression is stopped, there will be a tremendous task to reconstruct this country. Big business has failed. I have often said on the platform that the test of any institution is not what it can do in peace, but can it see the State through in a crisis? If it cannot, it is a failure. That, after all, is what is facing us as the British Trade Union Movement today.

“Lastly, I have to ask you virtually to place yourselves at the disposal of the State. We are Socialists, and this is

THE JOB TO BE DONE

the test of our Socialism. It is the test whether we have meant the resolutions which we have so often passed. I do not want you to get worried too much about every individual that may be in the Government. We could not stop to have an election; we could not stop to decide the issue. But this I am convinced of: if our Movement and our class rise with all their energy now and save the people of this country from disaster, the country will always turn with confidence forever to the people who saved them. They will pay more attention to an act of that kind than to theoretical arguments or any particular philosophy. And the people are conscious at this moment that they are in danger.

“We are in this job to win this war, to save our own homes and our own people. I am asking you for sacrifice. I will do my best, and the Government will do its best, to restore it to you afterwards. When this victory is complete, it is my Department that will deal with it, and I want to stay there until it is through if I can, for that one reason. I want no higher office, or other place. Having put my hand to the plow I do not want to turn back, or shift anywhere else, because at the end it will be this Department that will deal with the International Labor Office; it is this Department that is responsible for international labor. In the same spirit that I am trying to find a different equilibrium for the countryside, so I want, if God spares me, to play a part in the end in trying to put international labor on terms of equality for everybody throughout the world.”

4

BRITAIN'S CRISIS: EQUIPPING THE FORCES

WHEN I took office I felt, in the great machine I was trying to establish, that the best thing to do was to meet the trade union representatives, endeavor to explain in as simple a way as I could what we were trying to do, and get their cooperation and understanding in the common effort. In May, 1940, when we took office, Holland was invaded, Belgium was on the point of collapse. In a few days the French front was broken and France was out of the war. We had sent nine divisions to France, fully equipped; we had laid out great airdromes complete with spare parts and equipment for a substantial flying force. Like the snuffing of a candle it all went, and after a few days in the Government we were called together by the Prime Minister and told that if we could get ten or twenty per cent of the men out of Belgium and Northern France we should be lucky. There was virtually no equipment left at home for defense, because the Army had been built up on two or three divisions going to France, suddenly expanded to nine, and our coast line apart from the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

ordinary fortified parts, was completely undefended. Those of you who have been on strike committees and in fights of all kinds, have only to imagine that situation, because those in the Government are only ordinary folk; the same kind of people with the same kind of problem—and the outlook appeared extremely black. We decided unanimously, come what may, we would fight on and be smashed to smithereens rather than surrender to Hitler.

We knew the task that lay ahead. One of the first things that had to be attended to was the defense of the whole coast of this country, because the Channel ports were gone and the whole of our defenses had been built on the theory that the attack would come from the East and across to the West. We were handicapped by the loss of antiaircraft guns; our supply of fighter planes was very low, our airplane repair arrangements had been based on the assumption that the Channel ports would still be in our hands.

The first task we had to face therefore was the preparation of coastal defenses, which had to be done in very quick time; and in my Department we had to organize nearly 200,000 men within three or four days and find equipment to set them at work right along the coast in order that the full preparations for coastal and beach defenses might be developed. When the records are examined, England will discover that it will forever be in debt to the building trade and civil engineering operatives, together with others who came to their assistance, for the rapidity with which they developed that coastal defense and in protection of this country.

When the history of this war comes to be written, that

BRITAIN'S CRISIS: EQUIPPING THE FORCES

period from May to July, 1940, will stand out as an amazing epoch. There were a good many people in the country who imagined that the thing to do to save ourselves was to conscript labor and carry out all kinds of compulsory arrangements. Although those powers were given to the Government, I decided to try and maintain the organized arrangements for dealing with labor relations that exist between the Trade Unions, the employers and the State, and do it on the basis of minimizing restrictions to the fewest possible.

The amazing courage and accomplishment of that marvelous Air Force of young men and the Navy were all we had to rely on.

If you were in the know, as we were in the know after Dunkerque! Only the historian, when he comes to make an analysis of the facts, will be able to reveal what the Navy and the Air Force did in that marvelous month. I say that no nation in the world was so near to defeat as we were then. No one was so near to disaster and no one was down so low in spares as we were at that moment, and for the whole three weeks nothing stood between ourselves and disaster but the courage of these men armed with a totally inadequate equipment.

Not only was that the position. In war, friendships are determined by your success and not by the principles you are fighting for; and, throughout the world, people who had been praising us and the principles for which Britain stood, began to adopt a fatalistic assumption that we were beaten. We were being asked: in the event of defeat, if we let you have this, that or the other thing, will you guarantee

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

not to scuttle the British Navy? It was an indication of the fatalistic acceptance that Britain was almost doomed to defeat. That is what we in the Government had to face during that fateful week. We also saw the working of the great diplomatic machine; getting ideas as to how this or that country would react. I said, "I do not know very much about Government; I have not before been in during the conduct of a war; but I have been in lots of fights and I never relied on sympathetic action." I made up my mind where I could win and went ahead. If the sympathetic help came along, I should be glad. It would be added strength.

We agreed that the whole economy of this country had to be put on a war basis and that Britain, in the last resort, would defend the citadel of freedom. Then we had to make calculations of what we were up against and try and visualize it! Germany had under her control 250,000,000 people. There was a procession to Berlin, almost like tourist traffic, of people who hated her or feared her. When people resort to tactics as against principles, I feel that their destiny may be written on the wall. We were determined to fight this war out on principles, but we were conscious that we had ranged on the other side the great productive capacity of Czechoslovakia, the huge labor forces of Poland, the oil of Rumânia, the subservience of Italy, the broken condition of France, and the hesitancy of Spain. It is all very well to criticize Franco, but he is in a terrible fix. Not only is he in a fix, but our friends in Spain are also in a fix. Everybody is in a fix. They do not know where the Moloch is going to move next. If in the handling of this problem we seek to strengthen this or that position, do not misunder-

BRITAIN'S CRISIS: EQUIPPING THE FORCES

stand us. In the midst of this struggle we have the people, and a great industrial machine—an industrial machine that has to rely for its raw material and war needs on the courage of the Navy and our Mercantile Marine. We have to rely on a skill, and call for an output that must achieve parity with the tremendous productive force of Germany and all her satellites.

The task facing this country today is a tremendous one. In the first place, I want to refer to the enormous burden on the Navy. In the last war we had the Japanese and the French Navies working in collaboration with us. Today the British Navy has to guard every sea route in the world. It has to undertake a task unprecedented in history. It must not, at times, reveal its own successes, or even its losses.

The world acknowledges how marvelously it has handled the situation—transport of troops, evacuation of them again, keeping the sea routes open. I can never sit at a table and partake of food without being thankful for their marvelous devotion to duty and their great courage. But they must be equipped, and equipped quickly, and every man in the shipyard, whether he is working on a naval or a merchant ship is responsible for the effective maintenance of the Fleet. His duty when a ship is knocked about, or a new one is being built, is to put it into service at the earliest possible moment.

And this applies not only in the shipyards. It applies to the men and women working on marine engineering, gun mountings, electrical apparatus and everything else that is needed.

Unless the Navy keeps the sea routes open the blockade

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

of the country is made possible. They will do their part, but every man engaged on this work is now, as it were, behind the line, feeding the men with the munitions of war.

The first consideration of every Trade Union delegate, every employee in the yards, shop steward and management alike, has got to be, not any question of demarcation, not a question of who should do this or who should do that, but how quickly they can all combine to keep that great Navy fully fed.

Farmers growing food must work to grow that food to lighten the task of the Navy. Dockers and stevedores and ship owners with ships in port must turn them round as fast as they can. Men in the transport trade and the railways which convey the goods must handle them as fast as they can. They have a duty to lighten the burden of the brave men who, night and day, are patrolling our seas. In the last war the air attack was not as it is now. The Navy had not to face and avoid attack day in and day out. We held the French ports for the whole duration of the war.

The Army have gone through the marvelous movement in France—deserted; fifth columnists; treachery; everything, including equipment, lost. In the Middle East at that moment our forces were totally inadequate for the defense of Egypt. But today we have rebuilt the Army, equipped it—and not merely equipped it. You have no right to send a man into battle without being as well equipped, or better equipped, than his enemy.

We want to get rid of this idea that we are just short of enough. So many times, even as this war has gone on, we have been just short of a little bit. “A thousand airplanes,”

BRITAIN'S CRISIS: EQUIPPING THE FORCES

we say to ourselves, "there, so many guns there, and so many ships there—if we only had had them, the world's history would have been changed." Well, I want to make up those gaps as far as my department is concerned. I am an old organizer, I have been organizing all my life, and my sympathy is with the Generals and the Admiralty and everybody who, at the moment when he is about to deploy his forces, is just short. It is the duty of the civilian at home to see that he is not just short, and so deprived of the victory which equipment and man power can give him.

I have been asked as Minister of Labor: "Why are you leaving those skilled men in the Army? Why don't you bring them back into the workshop? Why don't you do this and why don't you do that?" Well, there is a very happy cooperation between the Ministry of Labor and all the Service Departments. I do not think it was ever happier. We know we have got a difficult job, all of us, and we know we have got to solve it together. People have been so used to having so many unemployed, they have just said, "Put so many men on"; and sometimes I think British industry has got a little bit lazy-minded over this man-power problem—and I say that it must begin to use its head, just as the General, the Air Force and the Navy have to. If I pressed the Army to release skilled men and then we were taking the initiative and making a magnificent movement, eighty miles across the desert at one place and 120 miles at another, we would have to slow down that movement if we did not have our skilled personnel following the Army to repair every breakdown, to keep every equipment fit. This might lead that Army into defeat. I would be no party

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

as Minister of Labor to taking a single man from the Army who, when it begins to move, should be there to contribute to the defeat of our enemies. I have got to say to the employers and the trades unions, "That is not where you must look for your man power. You must apply your minds to the problem." After all, there would not be a soldier fit to fight, there would not be a sailor fit to sail, or an airman fit to fly, unless he had been trained. If you have not got sufficient personnel for your industry, set about training it. Call the people from the nonessential industries. Cooperate with my great Department in order to fill up the gaps, because it is no use talking about industry being one of the great factors in defense unless you apply the same kind of calculations that you have got to apply to the fighting Services.

The task that I was asked to undertake was the mobilization of the man power of this country—no easy task. I have as representing the Government handling labor, 17,000,000 devoted, willing and determined people. Dr. Ley has got, I do not know how many millions who will at the first moment sabotage him and destroy him with as much avidity as I would myself. The underground feeling of resentment which arises from conquered peoples, if we hold our own, and hold the effort until we are equipped, will ultimately play no mean part in overthrowing the Nazi and the Fascist regimes. It is no use crying over spilt milk, but we were very neglectful of our skill before this war. I would like to ask employers if ever at any time they really sat down and calculated the capital value of a workman. I remember being in the United States twelve or fourteen years ago and I was asked to see some toolmakers in a great mass-produc-

BRITAIN'S CRISIS: EQUIPPING THE FORCES

tion establishment. I asked the principal: "What is the capital value of a good toolmaker in a mass production shop?" He penciled it out; figured out how many machines one toolmaker would keep in production, and the answer was, between \$50,000 and \$75,000. If you are running a workshop today, work it out—the number of highly skilled men to a machine—and then work it out on a capital basis.

We have allowed skilled labor to rot during the past ten or fifteen years. I am not castigating one party or another; I think the whole public appreciates it. I hope that when this war is over it will not be forgotten in the reconstruction. We have to get—I cannot give the figures or it would be telling the enemy—an enormous army of people to fulfill this program at the time we want to fulfill it. No one wants this war to drag out. It is in everybody's interest to get this business over as quickly as possible. The only way we can get it over is to get parity with the Germans, or supremacy—supremacy in equipment that will not only save Britons, but will save Germans. If I know the Nazis, once supremacy is won in equipment and men, the morale of the Nazis will break. That is the objective. How can we get it? It took four years in the last war to reach maximum output, with all the facilities of the navies of the world at your disposal. Do not ask me for a date, but let me say that every man we train, every woman we train, every person we get capable of production, every person we prevent being idle for a day—is going to bring that date of parity within months instead of within years. Is not that a goal well worth striving for? Do not let us worry about what it costs: if we are ruined at the end of this war what does it

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

matter, if our souls are our own? Count it in terms of human values and not in the terms of mere property and money—we can easily rebuild again.

You can easily recreate wealth, but you cannot create liberty once it has gone. Once a nation is put under another—and no one knows it better than we—it takes years and generations of struggle to get liberty back.

5

REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

FOR the first time in the history of England, every penny, every inch of land, every item of wealth, factory and workshop is now at the disposal of the nation. Private individuals can be compelled to subordinate any private interest or gain for the common weal. The Government has taken action to control the factories and production. Everyone is not merely acquiescing, but wholeheartedly accepting the necessary restraint to achieve victory. Is not this the greatest evidence that you can get of a grim determination to put an end to aggression?

We have determined to remove every obstacle to production in order that our Forces and Mercantile Marine, everybody and everyone of those who are now risking their lives to defend us, have every possible supply. We will allow nothing to stand in the way.

Among those powers there has been taken the power to control labor supply, equally with wealth which means that it is to be organized on the most efficient basis—and one of the great resources that this country enjoys is the skill and

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

initiative of its people. It is to us now more precious than gold, and we are determined not to allow a single ounce of that skill and energy to be wasted. We wish to train more.

The duty of controlling this tremendous organization of labor supply was imposed upon me as the Minister of Labor, and I am conscious of the tremendous responsibility resting on my shoulders. I have to deal with the people whose love of liberty is in their very blood, but without waiting for the perfecting of our plans the workers rallied with an amazing speed; the acceleration of output has been beyond our dreams. But we must still do more, and more we will do.

I have no doubt that many have wondered how it was possible, in a democratic country like ours, for a Minister to initiate and organize in a few days for this great task. Happily my duties were eased by the fact that, though these powers are great, there was little need to exercise many of them except in a regulatory sense, or, in other words, exercise them except in guiding the people to the right places so as to use their services in the best way.

For, drastic as these powers may appear on paper, they were brought about by the act of democracy itself. They were granted to the Government by the overwhelming consent of the people or, if I may put it in another way, the people of the United Kingdom placed themselves upon the altar of the nations and the Allies. Indeed, I go further, they placed themselves upon the altar of civilization itself in order to preserve it against brutal aggression.

My task is to see that this great offer is used wisely; not an ounce of its value is lost. I and my staff and those who

REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

have so readily come forward with their great organizing ability drawn from labor and management, are working with a will to give an opportunity to every man, woman and child, to contribute their best, and one of the things that must gladden the heart of trade unionists all over the world is that the Great British Trade Union and Labor Movement is the machine through which I work. They voluntarily assist in the administration of this task. They use their branches and their resources to assist in the necessary disciplining and control for us. With their great experience, they help to organize and carry out the necessary mobility of our people. That great Trade Union Movement with its foresight and wisdom has taken the opportunity of demonstrating to the world that it does not exist merely to fight for wages and hours of labor alone, but, as the call has come, to show their capacity to save the nation. In the saving of it they will win the gratitude and confidence, not only of their own people, but of every lover of liberty throughout the world.

And then management right from top to bottom has thrown its weight in. All its managerial ability, its technical skill, is being placed at our disposal. Calculation of profits and all the other things that have cluttered up progress in the past has to go, and the great genius of our managers and technicians is being given full play—and never in the history of our country has it had a greater opportunity. It is not to satisfy a dividend that they are working, it is for the greater contribution they are glad to make for the benefit of us all.

We have left behind discussion on academic matters. We

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

have ceased to make fine calculations and forecasts. The Allied countries are ravished and the enemy is at our gates. We will do all the settling up at a later date. It is the enemy's defeat, and that alone, which is the great motive power driving the British people now.

Our nation has a right to be thankful for the amount of industrial negotiating machinery that was established under the Whitley Scheme between the last war and the outbreak of this one. A real analysis of the value of that machinery and its contribution to the war effort by adjusting differences between the State, the employers and the Trade Unions, is worth a careful study.

First, it had a remarkable and steady influence when the crisis fell upon us.

Second, it permitted discussion on wages and conditions problems on a footing which allowed every factor to be taken into account. Problems of inflation, deflation, costs, future of the industry, problems of management and of operation are all now brought within the realm of discussion, and in that discussion the influence, knowledge and experience of the last post-war settlement have been borne in mind.

It is a form of machinery which has produced the beginnings of an industrial democracy; it will, as time goes on, probably take on new and more important functions. It has been most effective in breaking down divisions and barriers that hitherto existed, and perhaps one of the most remarkable things about it is that all that was needed in order that

REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

it might function in wartime was the addition of a national arbitration procedure. I appealed to both sides to regard themselves as trustees on behalf of the nation and, particularly, to act in that spirit if they desired to preserve this form of industrial negotiation both during the war and at the end of the war. An examination of the cases that have had to go before the court would reveal that this appeal was responded to; and in the main the cases that have had to be decided by independent determination have been primarily those in which the State was the Paymaster, and industry was in a rather difficult position in determining it.

There has been much criticism of what is called the absence of a wage policy, and suggestions have been made that we ought to have adopted some form of wage regulation which would have dealt with the whole of the problem en masse. I have taken the opposite view.

Such a procedure would not permit of adjustments in the industries themselves based on changes in operation, on skill, on the introduction of women, on upgrading and a variety of other matters which happily the joint machinery has been able to deal with without their ever really coming before the public at all. And yet in every one of these cases there were the germs of very serious disputes if the negotiating skill, ability and executive authority of the respective organizations on both sides had not been at the disposal of the State.

There is, of course, the further question of general adjustments based on the change in the value of money and purchasing power. Well, I do not believe that any better settlements would have been reached if we had tried to deal

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

with them en masse than those which have been made in the respective industries. It would have inevitably caused the introduction of political pressure in the adjustment of wages which might have resulted in very serious mass turmoil at a time like this. I think experience has demonstrated the wisdom of the policy that has been followed.

We have had to introduce great changes—dilution, upgrading, the provision of man power for the Services, the movement of people from their usual industries and occupations into others, and the introduction of women. Yet is it not striking that at no period in history have actual stoppages or interruptions in production been on a lower level than since the outbreak of this war? It can be readily understood, therefore, how reluctant we should be to throw over the present method of dealing with this problem for some untried and doubtful political procedure which might well produce disorder and chaos.

Another important point to remember is that this criticism has not come from those who are in the habit of dealing with these problems but in the main from those who have had little or no experience in the handling of industrial relations.

The situation which has arisen, and which will continue to develop, probably in a more intense form, as the problem of man and woman power has to be dealt with in greater and greater detail, will call for the utmost discussion and accommodation between the two sides, and I am glad to have this machinery readily available to assist the Government in coming to right conclusions.

Our policy was based on the principle that we were

REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

likely to get quicker and better results by the voluntary discipline of the people—expressed probably for the sake of equality and universality in its operations, in the Orders in Council and in Regulations and legislation, but actually expressing the desire for self-abnegation and submission to the public need. And if you would follow through with great care the Orders that have been issued—and they are legion—you will recognize the great care that has been taken not to abuse the power of the Executive, but to rely on good will and national response.

Whenever we have erred or gone too far, even in words, it has been very striking how Parliament has intervened and, to use the Trade Union phrase, “referred it back for further consideration.”

One of the steps I had to take was to make provision to make strikes and lockouts unnecessary, and I am glad it was done by consent. The National Arbitration Tribunal has been established which, together with the Industrial Court, and the other forms of independent tribunals, has provided adequate means to get all difficulties adjusted fairly; but our wage policy rests in the main on the proper and full use of the wage machinery existing in each industry.

And now if I may proceed to deal with the problem in greater detail, one of the first acts of the Government was to hand over to the Ministry of Labor very great powers to deal with man power, and the question arose as to how those powers should be exercised. The first step I took was to appoint a Consultative Committee between the Trade Union Congress, the employers and myself, over which I

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

have regularly presided and by which I have the opportunity of gauging what would be the reaction of industry in relation to each step that it has been necessary to take.

One of the most difficult problems was dealt with by the Restriction on Engagement Order. The labor situation was in chaos. Contracts had been given out to different firms on a basis which enabled them to poach men from other employers and from local authorities, and the steps they were taking to achieve their end would have soon resulted in a complete disorganization of our industrial effort. What was more serious was that this was undermining the whole of the Trade Union Movement itself. Agents of a very undesirable kind, who were bribing people to leave one place to go to another and who were profiting by such exchange, were beginning to spring up. We had to look to the future: that way anarchy lies.

We also proceeded to set up a Board of Labor Directors—experienced men drawn from management and the Trade Unions, who knew the lay-out of the shops, who knew industry and labor problems, assisted by representatives of the Department; and no Government could have been better served than we have been by this Board.

We then created the Labor Supply Committees in many districts of the country. Here again, while they had to be hurriedly improvised and appointments made with great expedition, the individuals who have been appointed have justified the creation of this machine, and I am not too sure that with the great experience we are gaining for war purposes, it may not be demonstrated that such an institution should be maintained in peace time instead of allowing

REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

men and women to stand by and skill be lost because there is no scientific approach to these problems. We found that there was a maldistribution of skilled labor and I felt that if I had to come to the craft unions and get them to dilute for war purposes to a low proportion, they had a right to say, "We must have the fullest possible use made of the craftsman and in his proper position." We tried, in the first place, to aid the solution by a new agreement governing the tool shop, a problem which baffled so many in the last war. I feel this very highly skilled branch of industry still will have to be considered. Its value has certainly been recognized and its capital value to the country cannot be expressed in pounds, shillings and pence. I am sure that when the time comes for the craft unions to re-examine the experience of the war and the outcome of these developments they will not throw them away; they will see what adaptations they can make in order that those of such value to the community are properly remunerated—and not merely remunerated, but given the right status.

We decided that we had to create a great central machine but that in its administration we would carry devolution down to the lowest possible point. Accordingly, the pivot of the organization was based on the Ministry's Divisional Controllers. I am conscious of the enormous burden that I have laid upon them and their local staffs. It is very difficult to graft an improvised organization on to a settled machine such as the Ministry's administrative scheme is, but they have responded splendidly. The Employment Exchanges that had to undertake this duty had, for many years, been engaged mainly with grappling with masses of

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

unemployed. The whole outlook had to be changed. They had to be directed to placing people and not merely paying people. The Exchange machinery had not been expanded as it ought to have been to meet this contingency. Even the accommodation, in many cases, was totally inadequate and had to be extended with great rapidity. Staffs had to be collected who had not had previous experience. I mention these things because sometimes, in the Press, when there are little slip-ups, they are immediately exaggerated and there is a total absence of appreciation or mention of the enormous part the Employment Exchanges have played.

But I have had experience in the most intensely bombed areas, and it is a matter for admiration and pride the way the staff of the Employment Exchanges have stood up to it. One Exchange was bombed out and our records all put out of order; we had to rely on the people's own statement of their claims, and it speaks well for the honesty and integrity of the working people that in scarcely a single case was our staff misled or were overclaims made.

It was found that the skilled labor available often was not sufficient to meet the demands of production. By careful handling, skilled men have been promoted and their ability used in the highest technical processes; and semiskilled labor, much of which had to be transferred from other trades, callings and crafts, has had to be brought in. It has been interesting to witness people from as wide a range as those engaged in the printing trades, as artists, shopkeepers and office men, being converted into engineering workers with great rapidity. To do this, of course, there has had to be a voluntary relinquishment by the trades unions of trade

REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

union customs and rules, and this has been carried out without any serious dislocation or difficulty.

We, like you, passed through a great depression, and during that period many people who had been apprenticed to certain trades had to leave them and find employment elsewhere—and, in passing, I think one ought to say that no nation can afford to allow its skill to run to waste as it was allowed to do during the last twenty years. When we get into trouble like this, the value of skilled workers becomes acutely apparent. It is one of the principal keys to the safety of a country and a vital element in defense. We had to get these workers to leave their new occupations—many of them in steady jobs—and return to essential war work. The method adopted was to register and classify them according to their previous experience. In shipbuilding, for example, anyone who had left the trade within the past fifteen years was asked to respond to this registration and many have been transferred back in order to contribute to the war effort and especially to the winning of the Battle of the Atlantic.

Then we had to tap new sources of labor, and to do that we are beginning to register the age groups over the present military age, that is to say over forty-one, and to find out whether they are engaged on essential work. If they are not, then the powers which Parliament has bestowed upon the Minister of Labor are used to direct them to the work essential to the war effort.

Then there was the question of women. The tremendous call-up of man power for the fighting Services caused an enormous gap that had to be filled, and it therefore became

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

necessary to bring into industry thousands of women who, in the normal way, would not be engaged in either office or factory. In order that it might be done with as little disturbance as possible, we are now, as productive capacity comes more into play, registering women of twenty and twenty-one, and others will be registered later. Out of this registration we are proceeding to fill up the vacancies in the Services. By Services I mean Nursing Services, Civil Defense, the Land Army, and work which women can do in the Navy, Army and Air Force, such as motor driving, cooking, secretarial and office duties; as storewomen, telephonists, teleprinters, in mess and kitchen work. This releases large numbers of men for the actual fighting line. The women are responding magnificently, are very keen to serve and are doing a good job.

Many more women have to be found for the factories to produce war equipment, to fill shells and for the public services such as street car services, postal services, and so on.

Thousands of these splendid women are married and have families, and I do not suppose anyone in this country thought, before the war, that a nursery school or a nursery center was necessary as a part of our defensive organization, but I assure you it is. First, from the point of view of looking after the children and the future generation; and second, in order to release the women to take their place in the workshop. It has been a handicap to us that there were not enough of these nurseries so we have had to improvise. We are registering those willing to undertake the duty of looking after the children of other families while their fa-

REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

thers and mothers are in the factories, and have arranged for a proportion of the cost to be paid by the State. We are also extending our day nurseries and centers.

In order to provide this essential man and woman power, we have had to cut down every kind of luxury trade and less essential work. Many factories are being closed, and the limited amount of production necessary is being concentrated in fewer factories. The people so released are available for one or other of the Services or for war production.

To deal in an orderly way with people available for work essential to the war effort, we have made an Essential Work Order which safeguards the labor force in these undertakings. By this means we are able to do certain things. For instance:

It gives the workers a right to a guaranteed minimum weekly wage to ensure that they are not suspended for short periods without wages.

It lays down that any undertaking that is registered must have proper welfare amenities, such as for feeding, nursing, medical attention, etc., in the works; and outside the works, provision is made for entertainment, recreation and housing accommodation for the people transferred from their homes.

It takes away the right of an employer to discharge a worker and the right of a worker to leave his employment, without giving a week's notice and also without obtaining the permission of the National Service Officer, but workers and employers can appeal to an independent board against the National Service Officer's decision.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

The underlying principle in this Order is that if you take away the right of a worker to use his labor in a free market and, in the interests of the war effort, powers are used to make him "stay put" and produce at the factory or works where the State thinks he is essential, then the State must enter into an obligation to the worker and see to it that he has security.

It has other advantages—it gives to the Government an intimate knowledge of how many people are wanted for each industry; makes transference within an industry easy and prevents an enormous waste of man power in the turnover of labor. It is of great assistance to managements; when they get the time and flow of material their output is not interrupted by constant changes in personnel, so the rhythm of production is substantially increased.

Experience during the short time the Order has been working has demonstrated clearly that, while industry has to carry additional liabilities, the improvement in organization and management that has rapidly come about is, in fact, reducing costs.

A factor that is becoming apparent is that you get better discipline and loyalty with fear of dismissal removed than you do by the threat of it.

Some people have said, in effect, to the State: "You must keep your hands off industry; it is not your business. We, the industrialists, are the people who know how to manage business." I suggest that no institution can claim the right to perpetuation unless it can survive and serve the State in the most acute crises. That is the great test to apply. I make that statement generally and do not apply it to one side

REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

more than another. Immediately a crisis comes, what do some great industrialists do? They run to the civil servant —the very man who is condemned by the great industrialists; they go to the man to whom they have denied the correct training because they say it is not the State's business. They ask the great State Departments. They deny the State the right to interfere in industry in peace time and say that it is the prerogative of the management. Surely that has been the claim made for a long time, and that has been the opposition set up to my political philosophy. Immediately the State gets into war or in a situation of that character, then, in order to meet the crisis, they have to call upon State institutions to bring them together, to organize and to take control, and they have to put men in charge to whom they have denied the right training in peace time to cope with the situation.

I did not, in making that statement, intend to be controversial. I have stated a fact.

Let me turn to the question of the turnover of labor. Some people say that industry relies upon the power of dismissal to maintain discipline. What does that mean? It means that there is an economic drive on the workman to work, the ability to force your will on another by the imposition of starvation, which induces fear and resentment in the other man's mind. By relying on that, you do not get the right kind of discipline. Recently I met a whole group of shipbuilders—and what was their cry? They said, "You, the Minister of Labor, must undertake discipline." I said, "Why?" They replied, "We cannot." I said, "Why can't you?" They replied, "Because sacking is no good." That

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

means that the basic condition upon which a system is run has been starvation or the ability to make another citizen unemployed.

The other day I appealed to, or directed, or whatever you like to call it, everybody who has been engaged in shipbuilding to register. In the first few days there were registered 49,000 persons, who had left or been driven out of that industry in the last fifteen years. Happily, most of those men, after three or four years' unemployment, had found new jobs; some of them, I am glad to say, good jobs, secure jobs. Some are in business. I now have to take those men out of those secure jobs to go back to the shipyards. There were men from insurance companies, men employed by a university, and in all kinds of capacities, many of them in secure jobs and some with pension rights. I have to put them back into this industry, where they will help the nation. Some are going back with \$10, \$15, or \$25 a week less than they are now getting in their permanent jobs. They have already responded and are going back to help the nation.

We have a grave responsibility, in the struggle and crisis through which we are going now, because of the policy which we allowed to be followed for fifteen years, in driving the best skilled men out of the industry and, what was worse, driving out the facilities as well. People say to the Minister of Labor, "Make that position good in nine months," when the facilities are not there and the men have been driven into other employment. It cannot be done all at once.

I have tried to get over the position by carrying the men

REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

with me. I know the British workman. When you meet in conference two parties who have been opponents in their economic struggle, up to the war and after the outbreak of war, it is very difficult to overcome the feelings that exist. A little conciliation sometimes wins your way, in those circumstances, better than a big stick.

I am told that I ought not to make these appeals, and not to persuade people, but to order them. Every decent manager knows that if you overdo the ordering business, you get a reaction and disaster; that is not the way to get output. Therefore, I decided to interpret these Orders in a perfectly reasonable manner.

6

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

SOME industries, of course, had to be singled out for treatment on a national or industrial basis, for example, the mining industry. It was our intention to give to that industry a labor force on the basis of the production then contemplated, but with the loss of the continental markets the situation changed. Immediately the order to send men back to the pits had to be modified and subsequently virtually removed altogether. Certain areas in the country found themselves with large numbers of unemployed. The mining industry, however, being under a separate Department, my course of action, as Minister of Labor, must to a large extent be influenced by the recommendations I receive from the Department. I am glad that no panic action was taken because of the markets referred to.

Stacking of coal was indulged in, a policy which I think was extremely wise. In fact, I take the view that more stacking even for the export market should be indulged in, so that when the war is over, instead of making the blunder

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

we made in the last war, of charging high prices and destroying our own markets, we should have ready and available large quantities that could be shipped immediately to get our market back. But even with all this, there are certain numbers of men who cannot find employment during the war in certain export districts. The only course open to us in those cases is to transfer them to the districts where the production is highest or to other industries.

Agriculture was another industry calling for men, although very exaggerated claims were made, and when the problem was tackled it was found that many of the claims were unjustified. An Order was made restricting people from leaving the land, and sending them back to the land. But before doing this we felt it necessary to put the wages of the countryside right, and I think the steps which were taken have met with the overwhelming approval of the nation as a whole.

Before I issued the Order relating to agriculture I said: "I cannot issue an Order telling you to stay in agriculture unless you have a wage which is commensurate with your services." We established for the first time what I believe is a decent minimum wage for the agricultural industry. I am rather proud of that because I think it has tended to revolutionize agriculture. Once you have fixed the wage—and it is costly—it is essential to increase production. The Treasury soon gets tired of subsidies.

Cabinet committees are considering drainage on a far bigger and more scientific scale than has ever been done. Land is being brought back to cultivation in a new way; forestry will have to be put on a new footing, and the efforts

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

and drive in this new standard not only creates an equilibrium between town, country and village, but it also tends to produce a more efficient system than we have hitherto known. We established in that Agricultural Act a precedent that I should not mind being established everywhere. When rent is being fixed, the accommodation has to be provided on a standard laid down by the Ministry of Health and even the highest standard must not exceed, as rent, $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the wage.

In the building trade various devices had to be resorted to. In the first place, what was known as the Uniformity Agreement was established and certain minimum hours guaranteed on Government work, traveling and lodging allowances as defined by the agreement were approved.

The call upon the building industry is very great, and in this connection it was one of our objectives that there should be created a Building and Works Ministry for the purpose of coordinating the whole of the building work under the Government, carried out by the Government or on the Government's behalf so that the labor might be utilized in the most effective manner. The need for labor has become even more acute now when not only have we to deal with new construction, but there is the question of demolition, clearances and the repair of damaged houses in order to give the people immunity from the worst effects of the weather.

The shelter program has created an enormous demand. We found that there was a shortage of material and not only was there a shortage but there was a constant demand made upon the building material industries in order to

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

cope with the Defense Works which were necessary to prevent invasion. We had to take steps to give orders for a good period in advance; to get the wages put right in the industry, and then to bring men back, either from the Army or from other industries in order to produce the necessary material to cope with the problem.

In this and in other industries there is one fact brought out which is very disturbing: the policy of rationalization and monopoly may have some virtues, but it creates an attitude of mind which is not easily adapted to the urgent requirements of war. There is a tendency to argue: "What is going to happen if we increase our capacity and have a surplus at the end of the war?" Not only in this industry but in others one has come up against the consequences of allowing large interests to use their position to cause the closing down of works which may not be so efficient but which would be invaluable at extreme moments. You get the same problem with the pits and in other directions. And where the production is needed for war we shall have to have regard to these reserve forces being maintained in such a position that they can be brought into full use very quickly.

However, the speed with which things are moving now ought to enable us to make up a good deal of the leeway in connection with the building industry.

We have been seriously handicapped in this war due to the insufficiency of timber, and home production has had to be increased. There were brought in, prior to our coming into office, men from Newfoundland and elsewhere to cut timber, but unfortunately the whole of the forestry busi-

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

ness has been attached to agriculture and has never been looked upon as a real factor in the nation's requirements. The conditions associated with the forestry workers and the agricultural workers are not the same, and the attitude of mind in the past towards this problem has seriously handicapped the provision even of home supplies and we are now taking steps to remedy this position. More men ought to have been trained for forestry work. Greater vision should have been exercised. Rigidity of approach to these matters has handicapped us.

In the case of the sea, we have operated again on a national basis, through the Ministry of Shipping, although in all these cases the exercise of the powers conferred has been at a minimum because of the voluntary response of the workpeople themselves.

In the food trades, such as milling, agreements were reached which resulted in a quick transference of the men, and schemes were designed to group the ports of the country to enable men to be moved from one place to another to grapple with a diversion of shipping.

Shipbuilding committees have been established to deal with the mobility and the full use of shipbuilding labor in order to cope with the demands of the Admiralty, merchant tonnage and repairs, but there is need of very great acceleration, particularly on the repairing side. Every ship that may be damaged must be put back into commission as speedily as ever we can. Anyone who hampers in this work is playing Hitler's game. The Navy can beat the submarines, but where now and again they do manage to escape the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

vigilance of that wonderful force and damage a ship, then we in the repair yards must make that good.

The greatest difficulty of all is the munition trade. It divides itself up into many parts. The making and the equipment of the munitions of war, the ordnance factories, the equipment, the clothing, the small arms, domestic needs, food and so on—they all come in as part of the munitions program. The nation will be forever in the debt of those Trade Unionists who have cooperated with us so magnificently. But if our Army is to be equipped and the millions of men who will be called to the fighting line when we take the initiative are to have at their disposal overwhelming resources so as to enable them to secure a quick and smashing victory, then more and more people must be trained. Every employer's works in the country must take a percentage. We will restore the situation at the end of the war.

Coupled with all these problems is the continuous economic adjustment that must go on. As a result of war we have to restrict production for the home market and that will possibly have a very serious repercussion on such trades as cotton and other domestic trades; but we are endeavoring by consultation between the Production Departments and the Board of Trade, to work out a carefully co-ordinated scheme so that it may synchronize with the demands for labor being made on the supply and munitions and equipment side. On the other hand, we must try to increase exports. Exports mean the creation of wealth to buy the raw materials to keep the war machine and our food supplies going, and there must be an endeavor to maintain a proper balance. In doing this we may make

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

mistakes in adjustments here and there, and this will need immediate attention.

The greatest problem that we have had to face is that of training. I have no doubt that the works managers were puzzled; they did not know what was really required of them and accordingly were inclined to measure their labor requirements by the manufacturing orders that were issued to them at a particular moment from the Supply Departments. They were not in a position to know or to make any estimate of the anticipated demands of the Government, and suddenly they not only had to meet greater demands than were expected, but they had to make good the loss of the equipment of the British Expeditionary Force—and to do this at a moment when the enemy was intensifying his air attack and when, in addition, difficulties had arisen due to the collapse of France. All this called for not only increased production but considerable readaptation. The Ministry was compelled rapidly to extend and develop the Government Training Centers. I have recently caused inquiries to be made into the working of these Training Centers by experts and, having regard to the types of work-people we have had to train, I am more than gratified by the report of the success that has been achieved. It is interesting to note the trades and callings from which the types that we have had to convert into precision workers were drawn. In one Center—just taken at random—the report showed that persons being trained at that moment had transferred from over thirty distinct occupations: some were men from other craft trades, others had been artists, barristers, shop assistants, pawnbrokers and directors.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

We shortened the period of training from six months to four, and in many cases where people have shown adaptability this period has been shortened even further. I have met some criticism of these Training Centers—most of it has been ill-informed and from people who have never visited them. But one must be guided by results, and the workpeople we have passed into industry have shown a very high percentage of success. We also decided to utilize every available place in the technical colleges. We have also taken over from the London County Council the Beaufoy Institute, which specializes in the training of women, and as soon as the complete scheme is in operation and we have the full equipment of machine tools, it will not be long before we shall be passing out for munitions production approximately 250,000 to 300,000 trainees a year from the Government Training Centers.

We have also eaten into the hard core of unemployment by means of training and transfer—not to the extent I would like, but it has been demonstrated that no human being is hopeless unless he is physically incapable. I am anxious to distribute those who are capable among the works of the country so as to get rid of this problem once and for all, and then the State must take steps to prevent it recurring.

The greatest facilities for training are, of course, at the works. If a person is not working in actual production there is bound to be a lag between the time he passes from the Training Center to the works and the time when the speed of production is made good. That we acknowledge, and therefore the more training that can be dovetailed into the actual

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

workshop, the more quickly shall we be able to carry out the expanding program which is so essential to equip our Armies. I am indebted to many works managers and firms for the response they have made to our appeal. We are particularly interested in the variety of the forms of training that are going on. In some cases experiments have been carried out by double banking. Others thought that this method was not so good as the separate training facilities: I think it largely depends upon the enthusiasm of the person who is running it. I have laid it down that there must be no rigidity: that experimentation, trial and error and flexibility must be the keynote; and then, too, the problem is affected by what you are training for—the form of production, and so on. All I ask is that the works managements will do all in their power to have such a volume of trained labor that our expanding program at no point will be held up.

Country after country has been mown down by Hitler, and many of their workpeople, technicians, craftsmen and men of their Mercantile Marine are in this country, and the Government decided to establish an International Labor Force. You have already read of the results of General de Gaulle's activities, of the exploits of the Polish airmen, the Czech airmen, the Norwegian seamen and our Dutch and Belgian friends. These people are fighting and giving their lives in the defense of the great cause; they are not refugees or aliens, they are our equals, and we cannot leave unused their ability, skill and energy. Would Hitler have left them unused in his country had they remained there and not fought against him? He would have used every possible de-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

vice to exploit their skill. In this Force we have already registered a large number of these international friends. They include chemical, electrical, aeronautical, mechanical, mining and other engineers, industrial chemists and industrial research workers. There is also a number of craftsmen and people with experience of particular trades and we want to see their services utilized in such a way that they are in fact making their contribution towards the equipment of their own Forces as well as to the common pool.

It should be clear that this Department only deals with people whom the Ministry of Home Security has certified as being all right. So far as the Government is concerned, our policy has been, from the point of view of social services and other State action, to treat them as equals with ourselves. They have their own Government or National Committees, as the case may be, and we have their good will and cooperation. We want them to feel that all those who are taking arms against Hitler or who have escaped from his clutches and are willing to resist him are members of a great community fighting back to establish freedom, and I want their people who are also resisting in their own countries to feel that they have not put their faith in international liberty and equality in vain.

In connection with the great factories, there has to be a tremendous movement of labor from one part of the country to another and this involves careful work, careful administration and a great intensification of the development of amenities in order to care for the workpeople transferred. For the purposes of dealing with this problem I brought into being the Factory and Welfare Board. The

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

Factory Department of the Home Office was transferred for the period of the war to the Ministry of Labor, and that placed an experienced and a splendid staff at our disposal. But the problem was not confined to inside the factory only. The health and welfare and billeting of the people had to be dealt with, so while the factory inspector deals with the problems inside the factory, I had to create a staff of welfare officers to cater for people when outside the factory. We have now issued and strengthened the Welfare Orders to enable the Department officers to do their work more effectively.

We have made available opportunities for training welfare workers and agreed to pay them, while at the university or in the works, during training at a rate similar to that paid to other trainees. This gives an opportunity to anyone who has taken an interest in welfare to go in for these courses. I want this welfare work to be put on as high a plane as it can be, because we desire that more and more attention should be given by managements to the personnel. You can have the cleverest engineers and planners in the world, but unless you have someone who understands how to handle the human being you cannot get the desired results, and I do not limit this handling merely to the work of the psychologist or the efficiency expert. I take a broad view of this problem; it covers the whole field of health, recreation, advice and care. In the factories run by the Government, it is a matter of regret that the treatment of the welfare side has been behind—in many cases far behind—the more modern employer. Really the State ought to have been leading in it, and the Ministry has now raised

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

the whole question in order that we may put it upon a proper footing. I know that those responsible for the actual management of these government factories will welcome this effort; they have realized the necessity for it, but it has been a question of policy and I am afraid the importance of it has not been appreciated as it might have been.

Everyone wants to shorten the war, and anything that can be done to give a sense of protection to the workpeople by increasing our defenses and at the same time by taking steps to prevent the cessation of production, will materially help us to reach our objective; for be it ever remembered the two things act and react on each other. If production does not cease, then the means for our defense are increased, the protection of our people is speeded up and the workpeople themselves are more securely defended. But those who take great risks to keep production going under these hazardous conditions are entitled—both they and their families—to be treated generously by the State, as indeed are all those who take risks, whether in the Services or in industry. We must not be niggardly. If production is carried on vigorously and this war is shortened by even a month, more will have been saved in cost than the State would be called upon to pay in relief to those who have suffered. Therefore, if production does not cease we shall shorten the war by many months and save the lives of thousands, and it will accordingly be wise for labor and management to consider the best methods to be adopted. This is a total war. We are all in it.

Welfare may be regarded as unimportant, but where I—and without any patronage, but as a right—have got it in-

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

augurated the workpeople regard it as very valuable. The duty of the Factory and Welfare Board is to try and see to the needs of the people and report on them in toto—recreation, entertainment and so on. The idea behind this Welfare Board is this: I have been dealing with State Departments all my life, and whenever a problem has to be dealt with in legislation, finance or commerce, everybody else has his needs all tabulated and ready to be placed on the table. I wanted an organization whereby you would place the needs of the workpeople in a definite form so that when each step is taken in legislation, the workpeople's views and their needs in housing, transport, and all the rest of it, would be brought forward in order that they might have an equal show with any other interest. If you could read about the work that has been accomplished in the interests of the people by that great institution which has only been in existence for a few months, you would agree it is an amazing piece of work.

The Consultative Committee, consisting of representatives of the Trades Union Congress, British Employers' Confederation, Labor Supply Directors and the Factory Department, worked out a model scheme of hours of labor. There was no doubt we caused a good deal of confusion at first by the urgent appeals to work seven days a week. These long hours were to be regarded as a spurt. It was impossible to keep them up and production was beginning to decline. I think the amount of overtime being permitted now means a great physical strain, and I would urge industry, as the further volume of trained labor becomes available, to give continuous consideration to it. I am satis-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

fied that if more attention is paid to this question of hours of work and rest it might well be one of the methods which, by careful adaptation, can be used to defeat the enemy in resisting his efforts to decrease production by air attack.

When the engineer goes forward with his proposals there should be a careful balance of time, capacity and endurance to work them, and it is in this connection I have urged a proper optimum of hours. I regret that some of my colleagues in their enthusiasm should have upset the ordinary working week. I think they regret it too. It certainly produced chaos. I am satisfied that with intense production the maximum optimum that you should go to is fifty-six hours a week. Of course, if there is man power enough to work the machine tools for seven days a week I have no objection, provided the man is given one day's rest in seven. I do not think going beyond six days at a time is wise. If the personnel is not big enough to work seven days, it is unwise to try and get over the problem by encouraging mere double time on Sunday. It produces the wrong mentality. Many tests have been made. Where the personnel is insufficient and the close-down takes place on Sunday, and if the work is on payment by result system, you get rather a larger production and the man gets just as good a pay packet at the end of this six-day week as by working the double time on Sunday. After all, we are all human.

My scheme provided for rest pauses, and I have carefully watched the result in well-organized firms who have been good enough to supply me with information. The great test is the bonus earnings: the rate of pay has not altered wherever the rest pause has been introduced. Where

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

bonus earnings have increased, that means production has gone up, the cost is down and, what is more important, it means quicker equipment of the Forces.

Then we extended to the Factory Department the power to see that there was a medical service in the works. I have been a long time associated with the Trades Union Congress in trying to deal with rehabilitation, but I think preventive medicine is better than cure, and that a proper medical service in the works, organized properly, paying attention to accidents at the right moment, may save years of ill health and injury. In order to get adequately trained men we agreed to find the money for a proper course at the London School of Hygiene in order that the right method of dealing with people in factories should be taught to doctors—not merely the sort of insurance outlook that was applied before. This is very important from the workmen's point of view. We have established, and it is coming into being, a very good nursing service for industry, which is vital with so many thousands of people employed. Instead of leaving the supply and training of welfare supervisors to voluntary organizations and limiting the opportunity to people who could afford to go to the universities, we arranged for bursaries at the universities to be paid for by the Board of Education, and their expenses, while they are being trained, by the Ministry of Labor—so that anyone, whatever their standing in life might be, can have the opportunity of this kind of work. This opens up an avenue to our sons and daughters which, owing to the expense, has been largely denied them.

Steps are being taken to introduce industrial medical

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

service of a higher standard and more generally applied welfare provisions, both inside and outside the factory.

I have urged that sick bays should be established. The period of the black-out has got to be faced. Nervous strain creates great difficulties. The dangers of colds and influenza, due to the loss of home nursing and care and the disruption of family life, present a real problem. The Ministry of Health is cooperating with us in an endeavor to minimize the effects of these difficulties, but we have not only to care for the population in order to keep up our output for war purposes, but we have to maintain the health and stamina of our people for the sake of the future of our race.

Another side of the task I have tried to deal with concerns the seamen. This country owes more than it can ever repay to the Mercantile Marine. I went to Geneva in 1936 and assisted my friends in the Seamen's Union to carry through the Convention on Seamen's Welfare in Ports and Seamen's Health and Accommodation. It was a pretty big effort in an international fight of that character. Believe me, it is so easy to put a thing in a manifesto, but it is more difficult to get it in an international convention. For weeks I stuck at Geneva, since, because of the experience I had, the Seamen's Unions of the World had asked me to lead the discussion. I was glad to do it, but I never dreamed it would fall to my lot to put in operation that convention. One of the first steps I took as Minister of Labor was to establish the Seamen's Welfare Board, and I am endeavoring to develop, through the local authorities and the Unions, not only proper accommodation in every port in

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

this country—plans are now being worked out for them—proper conditions, clubs and the rest—but in addition we are in touch with other maritime nations of the world in order to work out reciprocal arrangements for medical services for seamen, and proper places for them to go for comfort in other ports, so that internationally I hope I have started a movement which will provide for the Mercantile Marine, not only of this country, but of the world, on a far better basis than ever we have known hitherto.

There must be a great development of communal feeding. I doubt whether we shall be able to continue to maintain the stamina of our people if we rely solely on home feeding. With bombing in certain districts, gas cut off, electricity disturbed and communication interfered with, it may be necessary to have more than one meal a day in the factory canteen. We must take steps to make this canteen development more universal. I have discussed the problem of men and women working ten to twelve hours a day (ten is quite common) and two or three hours spent in traveling. I have pointed out the tremendous value it would be if, when leaving late at night with a long bus ride ahead of them, there was a short break, perhaps only five minutes, with the barrows going round the factory with good hot tea or milk and just a snack. It makes that journey home much more pleasant and not nearly so fatiguing. I want employers and the trade union in the factory to give consideration to this immediately; it will have a great effect in staving off the danger of colds and infection in the crowded busses or trains, especially at a time when the physical resistance is possibly at its lowest. That short break may represent in

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

the year a great saving in labor turnover, absenteeism through illness, and a great increase in production.

Then we must not ignore the possible danger of invasion. Do not be complacent; be prepared for it. What better place is there for disciplining and controlling great masses of workpeople than in factories? Outside the works they are apt to become a rabble; inside, the people are accustomed to management and control, and if feeding arrangements are also available then the works is provided with an additional asset. Do not neglect them. Using the facilities offered by this cooperative effort and in this field, the works managers can assume a role of leadership unprecedented in the history of industry in this country. I do not mean that the works manager can do everything, but he can become the commanding officer and he should have to assist him a thoroughly trained personnel manager. This is a phase I feel it necessary to urge very strongly.

One of the essential things for health is to get warm quickly, and one of the essential things for getting warm quickly is food—and hot food. Canteens ought to be available and there ought to be communal kitchens available immediately the bombing takes place, so devised that they can carry on. I have been told this was an expense. Well, it is not half the expense of a day's loss of production. It is not half the expense from the point of view of the morale of the workpeople we have got to maintain. And a very extraordinary kindness grows out of it. I have seen Bristol, Southampton, Coventry and all London—all these places bombed. I raised the question immediately the blitz-krieg started on London of having coffee rooms and can-

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

teens run in every shelter. It has been a grand thing to have done. Let me give you an illustration.

I arranged with a great firm to carry out an experiment for me, because you have to move by trial and error in these things. I asked them to adopt rigidly the hours I had set down in the circular I had issued: to give ten minutes' break in the morning, ten minutes in the afternoon with refreshment. The men had to work till seven at night and then there was a very long journey home, so I asked the management to send around barrows of tea and coffee at six o'clock in the evening, and to see the results. Well, I would like you to see the curve of production, particularly in the last two hours. If a man has been in the habit of stopping at five o'clock or 5:15, he goes home and he gets his meal about six-thirty or just after six. If he has got to work on with nothing to eat—well, there is a sinking feeling and then when he travels home on a long road (there were a number of women also) there is a great proneness to cold and to infection, and that means absenteeism due to ill health. Now, when that experiment I asked for had been going on for a month, I asked a director if he wanted to give it up and he said, "Not on your life. I have made too much out of it because of the increased productivity." In another case I had to transfer thousands of people to billets and fill up a munition works. Billets usually are pretty uncomfortable—compulsory billets are particularly uncomfortable because the landladies don't like having somebody dumped on them and—well, he isn't always made too happy. So the great trouble was, when workers left the works at six o'clock in the morning, to get a really good

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

breakfast at home. Now, it is all very nice for us when we get up and have breakfast nicely arranged, but I have heard grumblings in hotels when it hasn't come up quickly enough; so I arranged that the canteens should become communal canteens in the morning, and that the men and women who were transferred from other districts should be able to get a wash and have a good breakfast before going home. This has revolutionized that place.

Now, in a war, 95 per cent of the cures of the illness in this country is done by domestic nursing, not by doctors at all. The main cures are done by home nursing—a little "Scotch milk" for a cold, and so on. But when you have to transfer people as we have—thousands now—and billet them in lodgings and all the rest of it, you have got to remember home comforts are gone and we have got to do something to substitute and minimize the effects of the discomfort. Add to that, bombing—when you get it—and the nerve-racking situation!

I do really want a new approach to the difficulties of the problem. I don't believe there is any way in which I can write out a Regulation or an Order or dispose of it that way. You can't just say to a man, "Work all night," and if the man cuts up rough, not give a bit of consideration as to whether the fellow has had food enough or has been looked after, or had meals enough. You know, really, we have got to enter into the feelings of the man that we are asking to do this work and to cut down the horrible disparities that have dominated our industrial life in the past. I say this emphatically, because I have to think as Minister of Labor, of the country first—not only for this year, but possibly the

PROBLEMS OF THE HOME FRONT

next, in this war, and I want everyone to look ahead. However, time goes on, and there is always a danger of weariness taking the place of grimness; the testing time is going to come then, and I do beg of everybody to consider in your public life and everywhere else not merely this question of getting over present troubles, but the question of the task and the troubles we will have to face when the war becomes more and more intense. Because I don't believe we have yet seen the beginning of the war in its intensity. I believe that the devils of war will get far more intense as time goes on, and the issue of this war will be decided not only by the weight of metal but by the morale of your common people —by whether they stand it out. It is on that that our liberties really depend at the last resort, and by which the future Government of the world will be determined.

7

THE WORKER AND THE WAR

THE Great British Labor Movement not only believes this war is a just one, but is determined at all costs to see it through to the bitter end and to refuse to consider surrender before the aggressors, or yielding in any quarter.

I use the phrase "the Great British Labor Movement" because, while this declaration represents the overwhelming feeling of the nation, the feeling of our Movement is not based upon the events since war has broken out or on a sudden revulsion against Hitler and Mussolini; it has been arrived at as a result of careful study and, what is more important, understanding of the aims and ultimate purpose of Nazism and Fascism. Our attitude has been consistent not merely from the time of the ascendancy of Hitler; we offered the most strenuous opposition to the Fascist regime from its inception. We knew that a dictatorship of that character was bound in the end to lead to war and disaster. It either had to proceed with the enslaving of others or collapse. Rather than face collapse, we knew that the dictators

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

would throw whole nations into the vortex of bloody warfare.

The working people of the world can never reach their goal, which is the establishment of social justice in the world, except through an enlightened democracy. However benevolent a dictatorship may be for a period, it must in the long run resolve itself into a tyranny. It can scarcely establish for us things of a permanent or lasting character. Social justice, as we understand it, can only be achieved when the political and industrial system under which we live and have our being is capable of allowing such adaptations as may be necessary to meet the ever-rising conceptions of each succeeding generation. For any such system to work it must be based upon liberty. It must have a cultural background. It must be tolerant, recognize the rights of others and be prepared when dealing with other races and nations to give as well as take. Whatever may be said of us in Britain in the past, we had reached that stage of civilization. It can be said that the Labor Movement is the natural heir to great liberty of thought of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and that we have grafted on to it an economic philosophy which in its working out will enable us to achieve a real social democracy without loss of liberty.

I want you to appreciate that it was with this objective in our minds that we sought to heal the wounds of the last war. We proceeded to establish great international organizations of labor. In fact, the first international contact of a regular character that the British Trade Union Movement ever made was with the American Federation of Labor in America, and the exchange of delegates and of information

THE WORKER AND THE WAR

has been going on for a number of years. Thus, at the end of the war, we sought to prevent frontier barriers being erected which would divide our people. We secured in the treaty the principle known as the right of free associations. But one of the first to destroy that principle was Mussolini. To what extent he was supported by others in other countries who did not have the vision and foresight and who probably acted out of fear of us, we cannot tell. One of Mussolini's first acts was to murder his leading opponent, Matteoti, one of the martyrs who fell to his brutality because he dared to expose him.

Then again our Movement tried at bitter cost for years to save Austria. The Trade Unions of that country tried again and again to collaborate and even to enter Governments in order to maintain the liberty of that people; but behind it, even before the Hitler regime as well as after, there was the black hand of Mussolini. The country was kept divided and at the hour of its trial it was deserted.

In Germany, it must be recognized that the first movement to be crushed was that of the Trade Unions. Their funds were stolen, their people imprisoned and all contact with anyone over the frontier cut off. Nor was persecution limited to the unions; every form of democratic organization was marked down for destruction. The only question was when; with both Mussolini and Hitler the policy appeared to be to get yourself strong enough to make sure that when you struck you struck with such force that there was no chance for the victim even to wriggle, much less escape. It was not long before they passed from crushing the movements within their own countries to crushing na-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

tions, and in the crushing of those nations they crushed every semblance of freedom that existed.

This is not a fight merely of nations; it is a fight of those peoples who are determined to preserve their way of living, their right to free expression, free association, who accept as a basis of their conduct the word honor and who work for agreement in the fullest possible sense, against those peoples who have adopted as their philosophy force, ruthlessness, destruction and domination. Therefore, it is no longer a question as to whether Britain, France and their Allies shall be supported, or whether this or that people will come in and share the burden; the issue clearly is one of tyranny versus liberty. The question to which an answer has to be given is: On which side are we? The British Labor Movement had no hesitation in giving their answer. We gave it to the Government on the day immediately Mussolini attacked Abyssinia. We were ready then to go to the extreme lengths. We placed our all on the altar, and urged that aggression should be stopped immediately. The International Federation of Trade Unions over and over again have urged that the strongest force that could possibly be established should be brought into being to support the principle of collective security, and our interpretation of that phrase never meant security for ourselves as a British people, or security even for our Movement. It meant a combination of all those great forces in the world who place highest the high principles that we stand for; and, in view of the world-wide acceptance of these high principles, the struggle cannot be limited to peoples under a particular flag. It is a challenge which must be accepted by all who ad-

THE WORKER AND THE WAR

here to them, and these, when organized and united, are a far greater force than that which either Nazism or Fascism can command.

They have their Quislings, they have their Fifth Columns, but these are paltry things in this struggle if only the adherents of the higher principles act with courage and with unity.

I shall not be taken amiss by any one of my friends in the United States—indeed, I believe it will be accepted by them—when I say that if the fortress of the great Trade Union Movement was ever overthrown in Britain it would be gone throughout the world.

It is really due to the fact that we in the Trade Union Movement are wedded to the principle of freedom, of mutual aid, of the State being really vested in the people, that has brought us now to such a grim determination to see this issue fought out.

Whatever may have been the motives of those who tried appeasement, it can be truly said that the policy was bound to fail because these two principles are irreconcilable; and if Europe at the close of what is virtually a civil struggle is to take her part as the great center of culture, economic knowledge and even of finance in rebuilding the world, then we in Britain have to see to it that we are not influenced only by questions of geography or what has been described as vital interests—the term “vital interests” being expressed in communications, spheres of development or even raw materials.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

We have to go deeper, first to triumph, and then to place the principles of peace higher than anything else, or we shall have condemned another generation to renew the struggle. I am convinced that in the evolution of mankind one principle or the other must survive, that is to say, we must be free men and women or slaves, and as long as the issue remains unsettled recurring conflict is inevitable.

I believe that deep down in the hearts of the men and women I have met at the Trades Union Congress, in the great factories, in the little garages and other places, and in the offices which I have visited, this is the real basis of the spiritual urge that is making them resist with unflinching courage the attempt of the Germans to browbeat us by indiscriminate bombing, by the brutal form of warfare and the use of the great gifts of science for destruction. No, they will not submit, and in Britain there is a character which carries with it a grimness and a firmness that, once having accepted battle for a principle, is unyielding. I have witnessed that spirit—not expressed in spectacular displays or in demonstrations, but in the firm ring of their remark, when they shake you by the hand in the field, factory, docks or the railway and say, “We have got to see it through.”

The British Labor Movement came to the rescue of the British nation and the Commonwealth at probably the blackest moment in its history, and never shall I forget, and neither will those who were present ever forget, that wonderful demonstration of solidarity and support at that great meeting of Trade Union Executives in Westminster Hall just after we took office. Anyone in our position at

THE WORKER AND THE WAR

that moment who had to undertake not merely heavy responsibility but the duty of mobilizing the manpower of this country could not have had greater support and encouragement than was given at that meeting, both to the General Council and to those of us who were called upon to take office.

At that meeting, without having very much time at my disposal, I tried to submit a program of policy that we intended to introduce in order to grapple with the desperate situation in which the nation found itself, and while every item in that program has not been given effect to, the General Council would agree that we have not deviated one inch from the policy then laid down.

We had to ask trade unionists to agree to what was virtually a restriction of many of the liberties that they had enjoyed. We had to ask highly skilled unions to give up their treasured rights. We had to ask that demarcation disputes should be put on one side. We had to ask for training on a scale which, when carried to its completion, would be far greater than that adopted in the last war.

There is this great difference. Such restrictions as have been imposed have been imposed by consent. There is quite a difference where people voluntarily impose what is virtually self-discipline by a movement of this character in a war, and the method of dictatorship countries which impose it without question, or without consultation.

Even with such restrictions as have had to be indulged in and such changes as have had to take place, I claim that even the most Left Wing person in Britain in the middle of a war has greater freedom than even in Russia. We have

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

tried to the best of our ability to carry on the organization of Labor without carrying inquisitions and difficulties too far, but I want to make this clear, and I believe I shall have the whole Trade Union Movement with me: I do not mind so much what people say; I am concerned with what they do. The issue is so grave, that the future—not of imperialism, but of our liberty—is at stake, and we cannot tolerate anyone devising plans or machinations which hold up the production of armaments to achieve the victory that we must win.

Why are we entitled to Union support? When a town is bombed and homes are destroyed the cry goes up to the Government—and rightly so—“Why are not your defenses more adequate? Why is not your barrage more complete? Why are you not fighting back with greater vigor?” When the enemy is destroying the homes in our cities—our homes, the homes of the common people; not the homes that I want to see in the future, but they are their homes, their treasure and their lives—they say to us as we move from district to district where the devastation is taking place: “Hit back. Bomb the enemy.”

My answer is we will do that. An eye for an eye, if you like. But to do it we must have the bombers, we must have the bombs, we must have the carrying capacity, we must have the force, we must have the Spitfires, we must have the guns, we must have the Navy equipped to the maximum capacity; and that will not destroy so much life as weakness will.

The quicker we get an overwhelming force in this country the quicker will the Nazis cry off. It is the only thing

THE WORKER AND THE WAR

they understand. If our predecessors were wrong in appeasement, that is the greatest evidence for my claim that force is now the only check to those aggressors in the war. Therefore I say that, with the situation in the world as it is at this moment, on behalf of the Government I have to call on my friends and comrades for the last ounce of energy—not for profit, not for the Government, but for the protection of their own kith and kin in every street and every village of the country.

It has been a proud time for anyone representing Labor to have held office. It is gratifying to see, when the Executives or the General Council of the T. U.. C. come to the Ministry of Labor, that their minds are directed along the positive line; how to help to achieve the great end, which is victory. I make this clear because in the past we have made a claim, we have asserted that we have the ability to work out the destinies of nations. Today we are doing it. Today we are devising the plans. Not me; the suggestions are pouring out at every conference that we attend, coming in a variety of ways, finding ventilation in the talks of comrades, not of antagonists, talks in which we both want to achieve the same results.

There has been established—I think for the first time—a very close liaison between the Ministry of Labor and the Foreign Office. The object of that liaison is, in future, to get the whole of the Diplomatic Service to move and have their being in a new environment; to recognize that the limited Court Circular society of the Chancelleries will never return; that if there is to be a reconstruction of the world, then that reconstruction has to be brought about by harness-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

ing and utilizing the rising mass of labor to whom the future really belongs, and who must be the dominant factor in a new democratic world. There must be an absolute broadening of the curriculum, and of the right of entry into the Diplomatic Service. If the boys from the secondary schools can save us in the Spifires, the same brains can be turned to produce the new world.

Democracy does not mean to me a mere question of voting at elections. Democracy means to me a complete broadening, right down to the humblest home, of every opportunity in a democratic State. Neither can there be any limitation to a narrow class from which servants of the community can in future be drawn. These broad principles are being worked out.

May I turn to one or two immediate problems? I invented the idea of spotters on the roof. There may be some better plan. I say to the works managers and managements of industry: It is your duty, with your Trade Union representatives to make this a problem of research as the strategy of the enemy changes.

They can do it. I have led them in a good many strikes. I never tried to run a strike committee, they were always running me; but if I gave them a Minute Book and a pencil and appointed a chairman and a secretary—talk about strategy, talk about ingenuity, talk about cunning! They all do it. Let us harness that cunning and ingenuity in order that production may not cease. I do not care how they do it. They can do it better than we can draft regulations in London to carry it out.

THE WORKER AND THE WAR

I am often asked by visitors to Great Britain to explain why Labor over here is so wholeheartedly supporting the national effort in this great struggle. My answer is that we regard this war as a righteous one. We know there can be no material gain: Indeed, whatever the result, the expenditure and loss of wealth will be colossal. But we are determined to preserve our spiritual inheritance. We will not be driven back into slavery. The great driving power within us urging us on is the spirit of the crusade against evil. We have, as a people, emerged from feudalism. We have overcome the main ravages of the industrial revolution. We have struggled through the years in order to establish adult suffrage, true and free education. We have fought our way through miserable periods of poverty and inequality, and, at last, arrived at a stage where all the barriers which stood in the way of the people themselves, working out their own destiny, have been destroyed.

We were turning this new-found power to account—for, in spite of all our economic difficulties, we were tearing down our slums, rebuilding our cities and wiping out the terrible mortgage handed on to us from the nineteenth century; we had developed a status and a position which had carried us much further ahead than the mere stage of agitation. Indeed, we had won a position which gave the ordinary man and woman a full opportunity for constructive and creative work, and we were rapidly writing the characteristics of our age and the higher expression of this urge on the pages of a new civilization. The last half-century in this Old Country had been more progressive than any age which had preceded it. The great desire of the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

people for justice and decency in the world had caused us to expand and grant freedom to others who were within the Commonwealth, and this was likely to go on with even greater rapidity. The British people do not believe in dominating others. They want to live on terms of equality inside and outside the Commonwealth, and our conception of the oneness of the human family and the desire to promote co-operation with other peoples was expressing itself in all our international relationships.

Grasp, then, the spirit that this background had created within us, with a vista of opportunity and advancement before us, the citadels of privilege falling, the education of our children expanding, and you can understand how our great British Labor Movement viewed this monster of destruction, striding, as it were, over the face of Europe and approaching us with all his menaces. We realized that if he were not resisted and hurled back, our children would be condemned to centuries of struggle before they again established their freedom. We had before our eyes examples of Nazi activities and methods in Germany itself. Our colleagues who had worked with us in the international movement and had striven for the uplift of their own people had been murdered. It was a crime in the eyes of these tyrants for men to use reason or collaborate with the world outside. We saw the democracy of Czechoslovakia go down; Warsaw in a pile of ruins; Poland, with its checkered and thwarted history, again ravaged. We witnessed Norway, Holland, Belgium and France, which had meant so much to us, put under the conqueror's heel.

The Trade Unions recognized from the very first that

THE WORKER AND THE WAR

this was a monster of destruction, and sought by every means in their power to resist it and to arouse understanding of its rapacity and destructive genius. We never believed in appeasement. We accepted the view that you could not appease, and that everything you gave to it only increased its devilish appetite. You will understand that we felt: "Better death than surrender." At least, death meant that we would pass on to the rising generation the spirit of the fighter for freedom. If we tried to save ourselves by surrender, we should go down for history as craven cowards, and the very spirit that made the British people what they are would have been obliterated.

Then, again, the mainspring of the British Labor Movement is a spiritual one. After all, whence did we get our ideals? Over a hundred years ago our Movement was born—or shall I say resurrected—in the villages, in the local churches and chapels and the adult schools—before ever Britain had extended universal education for her children. Out of this primitive opportunity there sprang men and women with the desire to shake off all the shackles that bound them, and to establish a great unity and freedom which would enable Labor to get back into its own standard of life the fruits of this glorious earth which it had toiled to produce. Therefore, Labor, in common with the whole nation, is determined to see this bitter struggle through to a victorious end.

I quite understand that it is impossible for a type of mind like the Prussian mind to understand the spiritual character of the British people, and particularly that of the worker. We have arrived at a state of development which

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

is the result of long years of effort. We have emerged from dictatorship—for what does dictatorship mean but a state of serfdom in one form or another? It is the assertion of the right to dominate the life of another, to order him, to direct him, to make him subservient, to assume that he has neither the mentality nor ability to use reason and judgment and, if he dare to assert his rights, to persecute and suppress him.

Well, this was tried over a hundred years ago. We have had our martyrs; arrested for daring to organize, deported and tortured—the attempt by their masters to keep them in their place. But they broke the chains of slavery and, while there was little Press and no wireless and no propaganda as we know it today, the people of Britain rose in their wrath and resisted such tyranny. Indeed, even prior to this, it can be said that from Wat Tyler onward, there was an inherent struggle by the masses for the freedom of their souls. In the religious world it was not so much a question of theology that drew thousands to hear Wesley or Whitefield or any of the great religious leaders of those days; it was a stirring to give expression to the growing urge for religious and economic freedom.

The Nazis say: "We will build a new order in Europe." The basis of that new order is to be that the Germans are to be the superior race—that the Poles, Czechs, Rumanians, Scandinavians, the French and even the Italians—though they are their allies—shall be their laborers: inferior beings that feed the mighty German nation. That is the basis of their new order. To the German workpeople they say: "We will make you more prosperous, we will feed you

THE WORKER AND THE WAR

well." But that is a basis of civilization that the British character cannot accept. No, British Labor is not going to be satisfied to be regarded as a well-fed pig with no intelligence, fed at the cost of tribute from millions of others. It wants a good standard of living. It wants to assert its manhood and womanhood and the recognition that man does not live by bread alone.

There have been mentioned certain difficulties with regard to what are called the "Reds." I have got to be very careful, because some of these men are just unfortunate tools. I have had a long experience of this. Some men must organize something, and I wonder whether employers have given sufficient attention, when a man has the urge to do something, to the fact that suppression may make more Communists than anything else. A "place in the sun" is of vital importance. When you find a man irritable and anxious to do something, you may regard him as a bit of a nuisance, but give him responsibility and let him develop it. That is the way to treat that type. I generally made them officials or put them on a committee, and they did very well. Unions have got very fine men today who were once regarded, as I was regarded, as a blooming nuisance. There is an urge. With the growth of the big combines and big companies in recent years, the "places in the sun" have gradually become limited. The position at the top has been growing a little smaller and the opportunity to expand is not always there and a substitute has got to be found.

To my Trade Union comrades I say: "We have always

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

claimed that we represent the cream of industry. We have organized because we have been proud of our labor and always claimed a rightful place for it. We fought for recognition and status; we are now called upon to take responsibility." Just as we fought for recognition and the gaining of equal status, I want now to demonstrate to the world that we are capable and equal to the call that is being made upon us for responsibility in this greater task. You will not deny that the right of survival of any institution is how it has stood the test in a great crisis. Now is our opportunity to prove to the world that we can not only work and produce, that we are not merely hewers of wood and drawers of water, but that we have a capacity and character that are capable of working out the destinies of nations.

I ask you with all my soul, with everything that is within us—whatever the difficulties may be which we have to overcome in this great trial—use every endeavor you can, whether in equipment, whether in armaments, or in the export trade which is necessary in order to find the money with which to buy your equipment, in the turn-around of shipping, or in any occupation in which you may find yourself, to go forward as a great industrial army in this great and terrible total war.

And at the end it shall be said that Labor, by its skill, its crafts, its courage, its devotion, saved a great people.

8

THE IMPACT OF WAR

THERE has been no war excitement in this war at all. What is happening in this war—and you find it everywhere—is a war grimness—a grimness to see it through. There is no response to rhetorical speeches; there is no excited enthusiasm as expressed in the usual flamboyant manner of war. I think it is better that it is that way, because when a British audience is comparatively silent, it means more than when it is being effervescent. It is better that it grasps the facts and understands the obligations and difficulties that lie ahead.

It used to be said that battles were won on the playing fields of Eton. Whatever truth there may have been in that in the battles of old—and it never was really true—today they have to be won in the air, on the sea and on the battlefield; in the laboratory, the workshop; with transport, with the Mercantile Marine, with the civil defense service, and with everyone completely, whole-heartedly, applying unified and resolute will to this enormous task. It would be almost impossible to single out as examples of bravery and courage any section of the community. When I see, as I do

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

day by day, the worker in the factory toiling away after a restless night in a shelter in a bombed area, or after traveling long distances to and from work, carrying on his job with the intensity of the barrage overhead and bombs dropping in the pathway, I ask myself whether all of us have not underestimated in the past the capacity and courage of our ain folk.

I have witnessed work carried on in the factories with a merry heart, though at the same time there was knowledge of the enemy lurking overhead; carried on in a manner that would have won praises and places of honor had it been shown on the battlefield.

I have seen bombs removed—raced through the streets by men who have known that at any moment they might be blown into eternity, who risked their lives to save their fellow men.

This is not done out of bravado. There must be, deep in their hearts, a conviction that what they are doing is right: that the cause for which they are doing it is right; that what will be achieved will save future generations from the tragedy they themselves have faced.

The nation is entitled to call upon every one of us in the Government to be as perfect in our decision and policy as we possibly can be. I have no doubt it sometimes thinks we have not done all that we might have done. Criticism of us in order to make us more energetic, more perfect in our administration and effort, more imaginative in our work, we welcome. But it must be constructive and helpful criticism. The whole nation must cease to be negative and become positive in its attitude of mind and direction. We do

THE IMPACT OF WAR

not want to hear that things can't be done. If a thing is not done, the only justification for that is that something better is being achieved in its stead. That spirit I want to pervade the whole industrial organism of the country.

In this war the division between the men in the Forces, in the field, factory or workshop and in the Mercantile Marine has disappeared. Everyone feels he is in it, and everyone who is working is thrilled by every movement of the Forces and shares in the reverses as well as the successes. You do not say, "The Army has suffered a reverse," or "The Army has had a success." It is "we" who have had it. This attitude has been accentuated by the bombing of our cities and the work of our marvelous Air Force and the Army and Navy in defending us. This was expressed to me the other night by a woman. When the "All Clear" went she said, "I wish I could run out and grasp their hands and say 'thank you' to the boys who have driven them off." Her feeling was not so much relief because the enemy's planes were gone but that our very safety depended upon the courage of these lads. And when the men and the women are working in the workshop they have a feeling that they are contributing in everything they do, not merely to victory, but to their own security and the safety of their families.

We have not been beaten. We have not failed; we have won universal admiration by the courage and response of our people. The bombing of London and Coventry and the marvelous resolution of our women; the amazing resolution

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

in the first terrible blitzkrieg in the East End of London when thousands of homes were wrecked—you may say they were poor homes, but to those women they were their homes; it was there that their children were born; it was there that they grew up and their characters were formed. The very knickknacks on the wall were their treasures—and yet from the thousands of them rendered homeless not once did you hear the word “surrender.” We will avenge them. I do not believe in revenge, but we will avenge any war upon women and children. It is due to their stoicism; their wonderful heroism and faith.

The actual conduct of the war hitherto, and the association with and in it, has always been looked upon as a thing apart from the ordinary people. Their part was merely to obey and to fight. Now they feel as much responsibility as the Commander-in-Chief; there is closer association—much more intimate—between the high commands and the people than ever before in our history. And this great levelling has neither weakened discipline nor reduced initiative; indeed, it has enhanced both.

You may have heard a lot of talk about the conscription of labor—well, we are not doing anything of the kind. What we are doing is to register everybody to find out what their capabilities are. The people in this country do not need to be conscripted in the narrow limited sense, and put under a kind of military control in order to make them do their duty. What they say to us is, “We all want to do the most essential thing to win the war—tell us what to do, where we are to go.” Very good; to find out what they can do, we are registering them and we shall, as the great fac-

THE IMPACT OF WAR

tories come into production, more and more as time goes on, call upon them to come forward to fill the vacancies in these great undertakings.

Many people have never been in production before. Some may have been professionals, directors, office staff, and some of no occupation. But they raise no objection to being called upon to perform whatever duty the State requires, and I emphasize this again—what the State requires to achieve victory. All they ask is: “Deal with us in an orderly manner.” Therefore, we feel that dealing with the matter in an organized way, instead of the old haphazard method, is more democratic, more just, and makes for equality of sacrifice and effort. Further, it makes possible readjustment at the end of the war with greater speed, and demobilization will work more smoothly.

One is bound to admire the resourcefulness and resilience and grit of the shopkeeping community, and it is clear that whatever may have been our political philosophy and ideas in the past, it will be impossible to ignore these things when shaping the future policy of the country.

There is something poignant about the broken window, the damaged property or destroyed goods in the shops. You visualize, in many cases, the destruction of a life's effort.

Rationing and evacuation have entailed grappling with many complex problems: short supplies, irritability of customers and many other disturbances and irritations—all have to be faced by the shopkeeper and the shop assistant with equanimity. We go home by the early bus or train; they have to clean up. The warning has gone; they run the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

gauntlet. They never complain and we expect them next day, after a restless night, to be just as cheery.

Then there is the agricultural worker in the field. He has to turn out in the early morning darkness, and this is accentuated by the prolongation of summer time. It affects his work in getting us our morning milk, our vegetables and our food. We have tried to be just to him in his pay and make things better on the countryside; but he is using his skill, his genius and ability to see that no Hitler can starve us into submission, and I know he will do more.

Then there are the whole of the hospital services ever ready—stretcher bearers, nurses, doctors waiting and watching for any casualty, with the healing equipment at hand to minimize pain and suffering.

And the people behind the scenes in those hospitals—cleaning and washing and cooking.

The demolition squads, on duty twenty-four hours at a stretch, waiting with lorries and picks, in the event of anything untoward happening as a result of Hitler's indiscriminate bombing, to rescue those who may be trapped, and to send off to the hospitals those who may be injured.

You have read of the incendiary bombs, the fires. Well, we have adopted the great democratic principle that everybody must become firewatchers, either at their works, their office or in their street. It must not be left to the ordinary workman to do all this. In every scheme that is put up to the responsible authorities, care is taken to see that no person employed in any undertaking or living in a particular street escapes their obligation, and the striking thing about it is that the people in England say this is right.

THE IMPACT OF WAR

In the last war there was a good deal of talk about comradeship in the trenches—and indeed it was no empty thing, because there was a great change over a very wide field of society—but that comradeship was never mobilized and used as it might have been for social advancement. But it was there, and you used to find it showing itself in so many ways. May not this war, then, produce not only a comradeship in the trenches, the mechanized forces, the air and the sea, but a great comradeship in the field, the factory and the workshop? It is that comradeship—that new force—which can be turned to good account if it is not sapped or destroyed, and by it the evolution of our people will be more secure than any physical revolution can provide.

There is here a complete understanding of the connection between the workshop and the Forces. We know if we slacken production for a minute we are prolonging the war. We no longer think about employer and workmen in the old sense. We know that every one of us is a part of the great unit of production, contributing hourly to feeding and supplying the men in the Forces with their requirements and we know we have this tremendous task to perform, notwithstanding the attacks that are being made upon our factories and our homeland by the enemy. It is in that spirit the British industrial life is being carried on.

May I illustrate this by an incident I saw in a Yorkshire town? A factory employing a lot of women had been badly “blitzed.” The roof had been destroyed, there was no heating; luckily most of the machines and raw materials were undamaged. They were engaged in producing an article that the Air Force urgently needed. These girls and women

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

went straight back as soon as their machines could be cleared. They sat in the open and finished that order so that delivery might take place and work of the Air Force not be impeded.

So you see, we are not asking anybody in the world to do something that we are not ready to do ourselves. It is an old proverb that example is better than precept, and I think it will be agreed that the old country is setting the example.

The task is very great. Hitler, by forced labor and by intimidation of conquered countries, has brought under his control millions of people, a vast amount of plant and raw materials. Now, if we utilize every man and woman in the country on war production we cannot hope to have the number he has, but we have something he has not—a united nation. Millions of people now under his control would throw off his yoke at the first opportunity, but we have an army of man and woman power knit together, determined not to waste or lose a moment at production.

Another interesting fact about this war is the amazing way the health of our people has stood up to the strain.

Do you remember how the unemployment pay used to be criticized and how the social services were sometimes derided? Well, difficult as the period was between the last war and this, what a godsend it was we did these things, because if we had not looked after the health of the people they could never have stood up to all the inconveniences resulting from war—nights in the shelters, lack of sleep and long hours of work. We are using our energies now, in spite of shortages here and there, to maintain this health standard, because on that the morale of the people depends.

THE IMPACT OF WAR

No, we have not paid too great a price. We are reaping the harvest of the foresight of those—of whom the present Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill, was one—who laid the foundation of these great social service schemes which have added to the virility and strength of the people and contributed to the man power so essential now to defend liberty.

I want to express the Nation's indebtedness to the works managers. We are fully conscious of the enormous strain that those responsible for the management of our great industries have had to undergo since the outbreak of war, the readaptations that have been called for in connection with production under the war effort; the effect of the claims of the different Departments upon them; the vexed question of priorities; the handling of the labor situation; the constant change in the methods of production; the difficulties of working under conditions of air raids and attacks and at the same time keeping up production. These things have imposed an enormous task upon what I like to think of as the Industrial Civil Service; a task probably far greater than in the last war.

It was argued that if the State imposed an Excess Profits Tax of 100 per cent the great motive of industry, namely, that of profit, would be removed and production would suffer, but it is clear that so far as the works managers are concerned, they need no other motive to give the greatest possible production than that of winning the war, and they have been ready to give their best, actuated by the same

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

motive as the men in the shops, in the offices and in the Forces.

The intensification of the air attack upon our civilian population, I am satisfied, will have had the effect upon us all to intensify and, as it were, re-energize us to accomplish this stupendous task.

We hope industry will use its initiative and ingenuity to overcome any hindrance to output by these air attacks. There are many methods that might be adopted, but it is unwise to advertise them. We can't wait for regulations. We must get together and improvise, and help in every way we can to defeat the Germans. In this total war, industry must have its strategy, so if now and again there are slight interruptions the management, the Trade Unions and the workpeople can use their combined efforts to make good any loss sustained. It can be done, but not by rigid rules. This adaptation of the personnel in production is just as important as the Research Department or any other method that may be applied to win this war.

I appeal to my comrades at the benches to brave it. I know the risk involved. I know what has to be faced. I know the danger, but it is no greater a danger than that faced by the man in the Spitfire fighting the enemy. This is a total war, and if we do not stop production the quicker shall we create our own defense and security.

If you are going to work out military strategy it takes a long time and then it does not always go right. People study the tactics of Napoleon and a lot of other generals; they pore over textbooks; but in industry you cannot do that

THE IMPACT OF WAR

because you really do not know what you are going to meet next. You do not know what is coming out of the laboratory; you do not know what the scientist's invention is going to be; you do not know the kind of instrument that is going to be placed on the table for you to manufacture tomorrow morning; you do not know what the inventor is going to produce for you to mold into shape. You cannot reduce this to a regimental textbook.

Never fall into the error of imagining that any one Minister is clever enough to make regulations covering every possible activity. You cannot work to rule.

I am told that I ought to compel people to do these things. My answer is that when you have compulsion you must have the ability to select, and when you have to undertake the task of selection, clever as you may be, you are apt to select the wrong people. We have got through with the volunteer, and when the facts can be given of our aircraft production, it will redound to the credit of our people who have responded without compulsion.

This task of winning the war means you have to call for the utmost ingenuity you can get from the people, for every ounce of ability they have, for the willingness and courage to take decisions to make them indifferent to enemy action and carry on. I do not believe you can do that with orders from the top. Direction, guidance, yes; but it is important for everyone who is running an industry to realize that conscription of labor would mean every person waiting for orders from the next person above them, and a tendency to work to rule. Germany is feeling the effect of this, and

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

she is falling behind. She started off with twelve hours' work a day, two hours' pay of which was compulsorily put into the Nazi "kitty," but she has had to give it up and pay the money to the workpeople because her production went down. She tried to select students with the most scientific precision for training, as against the system we have worked in this country in recent months, and she is falling behind in comparison with us in the personnel to carry it on.

We are indeed regarding ourselves now as one army; a great citizen army, serving on every front. Everyone is being equipped to take his or her place in the defense of freedom. No, there is no weakening among us: everyone, young and old, is now a soldier for liberty.

The people have cheerfully abandoned their holidays—and are taking to new methods for exercise. Grounds that were used for football and other sports have been taken over for physical training, and thousands of arms workers, civil defense units and men waiting for the call up are taking full advantage of the opportunities provided.

I have no doubt that you are sometimes mystified at our self-denunciation and criticism which provides one of the most fruitful occupations, if not of the foreign press, at least of the British! But after all, that is only an expression of the depth of feeling that we want to do better. It is the great antidote to complacency and a check against the danger of self-satisfaction and false security, and is really the foundation of that democratic spirit which relies, for its spurt to effort, upon the genius of reasoning, thought and criticism.

THE IMPACT OF WAR

A few months ago many friends from overseas looked at responsible people in this country with a certain amount of incredulousness and with a gesture as though they thought we were whistling to keep up our courage, when we expressed conviction that Britain would pull through. But that was not what we were doing: the British character comes out best when it is in a sticky corner, and we have always managed somehow to throw up someone who is the embodiment of grim determination, and as a rule it has happened without design. It is one of the virtues of democracy that a nation is not dependent either upon a clique or a few people, and it calls to its aid for its spokesmen those who can express its will and its determination. In the last war, Lloyd George was the expression of the vigor of the nation; so now is Winston Churchill the expression, as he shows in his speeches, of the realism, the grimness, the resourcefulness, the strategic conception and the determination of Britain to win this war. In him is the embodiment of the democratic will of this nation, and to my mind it is extraordinary that in that other great democratic republic the people have expressed themselves in a similar way by the election of President Roosevelt and by the steps he has taken to contribute to the salvation of liberty and democracy in the world. As long as all leaders stick to democracy and interpret the will of democracy, they can rely upon democracy to see them through.

I have a great regard for works managers, and I wish they stood out a little more as a profession than they do. I do not think the works managers have had their proper place in the sun; they have got to get the job done, after all,

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

and they seem to me more important than the director who totals up the accounts at eleven o'clock in the morning. And let me emphasize this, that when bombing takes place, the morale of the people depends to a large extent on the courage of the works manager and the foreman who are making their rounds and holding the men together. I have seen, where works were attacked in different parts of the country, the way some of those men have gone down with their lives in their hands, and the way they have helped—with many of those shop stewards that are often criticized. The best has come out of them, and they have held the morale of the people at those very critical moments.

Let me give you a case: a works was bombed; a good works manager had built up in advance a great repair squad of all grades and crafts. They were as ready as the A. R. P. personnel. As a result of the heavy barrage of incendiary bombs the roof was damaged and the rainwater was pouring through on to the machines. This happened at twelve o'clock at night. As a result of that organization that roof was on for the shift to start at seven o'clock in the morning. That is what I call industrial strategy. You cannot put that down in a regulation. You cannot work it out. You have got to call it out of the ingenuity of your people. You have got to induce them. And what one works may do, another may do differently; but as long as you have the spirit there, all will find a way to do it. Thus in a strike I used to open a strike committee with a book and a pencil, a chairman and a secretary, and then disappear, and I would find they were all field marshal, colonel and sergeant-major by the time I came back, and had the strike

THE IMPACT OF WAR

thoroughly engineered. The same thing happens whenever you give people a task and ask them to use their heads. They will do it. I find in this country that if, instead of talking too much about grievances, you give a working man a problem, and you direct the mind to its solution, the man becomes quite different. He will cooperate with you in solving a problem. But if you meet to discuss a grievance on managerial functions, he will argue about it until you are both very tired.

I asked for this industrial strategy, and it is taking many forms. One that I invented was the roof-spotter business. I found that by the regulations made by the previous Government they must have had an idea that airplanes would come over, everybody would go nicely to the shelter, would all stop there, and in about an hour the planes would kindly go away and the people would come out and go on with their work. That seemed to be the conception of what would happen, but that isn't what did happen. The opposite happened. The planes stayed too long to be comfortable, and we were losing anything from fifty to seventy-five per cent of production. Now, I thought to myself, "This has got to be solved, but how can we do it?" And I thought, "Well, if you have a lookout man on a ship, why shouldn't we have a lookout man on a factory? And if I have a lookout man on a ship and I get a lookout man on a factory, why shouldn't I link up with the observation corps, and why shouldn't I link it up as part of the whole defense business?"

We have succeeded in the greater part of the country with the spotter system. Let me give you one illustration. A certain company in London took the narrow view about

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

wages and did not pay a man to be their watcher. If they *had* had a man on the roof of their warehouse on the dock they would have saved several million pounds' worth of food. On my hotel alone four incendiary bombs came down one night, just to keep me company, and the man on the roof dealt with every one of those bombs, each one of which might have meant a fire. Those spotters on the roof have exhibited an amazing courage, and I heard the Postmaster General say the other day that he estimated the roof-spotters business had saved the Post Office alone over one million pounds' worth of damage that would have been caused had these men not been employed in that work. This is the one thing Hitler cannot succeed in. This is where we have got an advantage. He cannot get his men to work under a similar system. And do you know why that is? He has built it up on compulsion and the Gestapo, and there is not a fellow in his works prepared to trust the fellow who goes up on the top—and that is very vital. Confidence is a great thing. It is the key.

May I try to convey to you the picture of Britain today? We are used to liberty—to debate, to argument—but practically the whole people have put this on one side; they have rallied with a great oneness to defy this ugly beast, this brute. They say he shall not conquer, neither shall he force us to surrender a single inch of the British Empire to his aggression; and is it not true that his defeat by the Allied Forces will cause the greatest sigh of relief that the world has ever known? It is this oneness that has made it possible for the Government to ask and receive from Parliament such drastic powers.

THE IMPACT OF WAR

I am thinking of what the railway men have undergone in the freight yards, the docks, the main lines; the way they have kept up the clearances of goods and passengers in spite of the attacks of the enemy. I have seen signalmen perched many feet in the air passing the trains through; the bombs whistling round them; the platelayer repairing the track; breakdown gangs at work—just ignoring all the danger.

It fills one with pride and admiration. We can only say “Thank you,” with the knowledge that they will still carry on. We know they are doing their bit, and it is up to everyone to make their task as easy as possible. The movement of goods and passengers has gone on in spite of all that Hitler has done or tried to do. It redounds to the credit of a body of men who are not under military discipline, but who readily risk their lives for the common cause.

Then we must keep the personnel going to and from the factories. The hours of work have had to be lengthened; the movement of people, with the black-out, has become a difficult task, and the men on our great suburban lines, our busses, trolley busses and trams have done splendidly. I know how they feel, I have lived and worked with them so long. I know how they feel about schedules, spread-overs and the inconveniences that are caused and the risks when the guns are firing overhead. The dim lights, the dark country road and foggy night—one has had to live in it to understand it. But in this total war it is recognized that they are in the front line and if they do an extra journey, or go out of their way with their overcrowded vehicle to get the people to and from their homes, really what they are doing

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

is joining in a combined effort to secure our ultimate triumph.

Then a word about the telephones and the post. Sometimes we get delay on the telephone; the call has not come through as quickly as we wanted. That letter not delivered as quickly as usual: we look at it and say, "When was it posted?"

In fact, these services have been so perfect in peace time that immediately there is the slightest interruption it makes some people think the world is coming to an end. But stop, think! Young women are in that telephone exchange; they do not leave their post, they are subjected to the enemy attack. In fact, telephone exchanges are one of the main targets; but there they stick it to carry on this great public service.

And when one does get an interruption, just think what is happening. The Post Offices Engineering Section is out with amazing rapidity, joining the cables, repairing the junctions, linking up all those mysterious connections that may have been broken. This is one of the finest services that any nation has been blessed with.

The postman with his collection and his delivery brings us news of our friends. And do we know what it means when we are in our shelters or at home? He is still going around collecting and he is still going on delivering in the morning. And the telegraph staff, including the lads, are all carrying on.

Think of the lorrymen on the road, day and night, often driving alone in the dark night, taking meat from the ports and food from the cold storage, delivering it into the shops

THE IMPACT OF WAR

ready for shoppers to buy it; raw material to the factories, urgent components and parts for the workers on munitions, all of which must be there at a certain time to keep others working.

Think of the strain that these people are willingly and cheerfully going through. Their wives and families are probably in another town, and may be sheltering from enemy attack. They have their feelings, but they cheerfully go on contributing to the desired end.

And then the miner down the pit. He is winning the coal so we shall not have the trouble that we had last winter, and the fires will be kept going, and gas supply will be kept up and we shall not go short of warmth, light and heat. He is getting from the bowels of the earth this precious material to ship abroad to pay for our food and raw materials, and to keep the great power of production going.

No one is more keen than the miner of Great Britain on winning a victory. Hitler broke their international and murdered their colleagues on the continent.

And the fishermen, bringing us this precious food from the near and distant fields. Attacked and bombed by our enemies, yet he is undaunted, and those who are not carrying on fishing have gone into the great patrol services of the Royal Navy. We must never forget the fishermen.

Then the fire brigades and the Auxiliary Fire Service: I have seen their work in London; their amazing mastery over great fires; the property that has been saved, lives that have been saved—through their fearlessness and courage. It is truly a wonderful organization.

And we must remember the police and the wardens and

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

all those who are so unstintingly contributing to the great work of civil defense.

Then there are the public utilities—who repair the gas pipes and water pipes when damaged, and bring back for our use as speedily as possible these public services. These workers, too, have dangers to face—explosions and electrocution—but they go to it ungrudgingly, whatever hours they have been on duty.

In addition, there is the work of the local authorities and their officials—vital services. And the clerks carrying on the great life of the community and making possible the maintenance of our commercial life and our contacts and trade with the rest of the world.

Another great service which is of tremendous importance and is contributing in a most amazing manner is the group of great voluntary organizations. They are unselfishly contributing in more ways than I can say—dealing with the homeless, the injured, and the welfare of our people.

Finally, there is one service that we must never forget—the service of our people in the homes, the people who prepare our food, our beds, and who are left hours by themselves, wondering what the result of the day may be, carrying on with a cheerful courage through all the inconveniences. Our women folk in the home have done as much to maintain the morale of the people in this country as any one. History will be grateful to them.

The circumstances of this war are such that they have removed class distinction. The one test being applied is:

THE IMPACT OF WAR

Are you doing essential work and thereby contributing to the war effort or the maintenance of the national life?

We are keeping the future in mind. For example, in selecting people to render war service, both men and women, we pay regard to family responsibility, to the well-being of the child, the position of the student and those who will be responsible for teaching the new generation; for we must not interrupt the studies of those under certain ages upon whom the future cultural life of the nation will depend.

Now, why is it that the British people will not submit? I repeat they are not fighting for territory or to dominate people—there is no soul in this country who wants to do that. The whole trend of our outlook and attitude has been gradually to build up the British Commonwealth on a complete basis of self-government; the labor and progressive forces in this country have been leading public opinion to that end for the last century. There must be an answer to why people are willingly making these sacrifices. This war will not make us richer—it is bound to leave us poorer, with a great burden of debt; and for the moment it checks the development that was going on in rehousing our people and wiping out slums; it is making us turn our energies from peace to war, waste and ruin. Is it not clear, therefore, that there is something deep within us that makes us resist the Nazi and Fascist regime?

It is the love of liberty, the promotion of the rights of man and the fundamental belief which exists in all of us that man cannot develop the higher virtues unless there is freedom of thought, full right to exercise reason, the acceptance of a standard of honor, and the firm conviction

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

that no single person can ever be allowed either to dominate or to enslave the people.

We are not going to get excited over one victory, neither do we whine over a defeat. We know what the ebb and flow of battle will mean; but as to the end of it all, I am not in doubt for a moment.

9

THE RIVAL PHILOSOPHIES

THERE is a tremendous difference in the philosophy that is guiding the policies of our enemies and ourselves. One is Fascism and Nazism, or Dictatorship; and the other is Democracy. The last war resulted in, more or less, an armistice. At the end of that war I did as much as any one man could do in this world to reunite in the International Labor Movement the forces of the Continent which had been set at each other's throats. It is interesting to note that I personally drafted the constitution of the International Transport Workers Federation, and was one of the first, almost before the battle had ceased, to cross to the Continent and try to reunite those forces. I was absolutely convinced that if we could only bring them together we would make war impossible. I have been sadly disillusioned.

I find there has been developed in the character and outlook of an overwhelming mass, as a result of generations of education, a firm belief that the only way peace can be established is by destroying other peoples, destroying their

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

liberties, and establishing the dominance of one race over the others. I take the opposite view. I believe that peace can only come when equality is recognized; when, if you claim rights for yourself you must be prepared to give rights to others.

It was assumed by the Germans that if they despoiled Czechoslovakia, with its productive capacity and its defenses; if they got hold of the raw material and food supplies of Poland, Denmark and Norway and overran France, Belgium and Holland, they would have under their supreme command from 180,000,000 to 200,000,000 enslaved people. The Prussian always acts on the assumption that the human being is an automaton; that he can be organized, ordered and driven and reduced almost to the condition of a robot. This type of mind has been predominant in Germany since the '50's, and has followed a doctrine of force and ravaged Europe many times, believing that by adding to the number of robots and thieving the raw materials and lands of other countries it can establish a power which will succeed in subduing the rest of the world. Already these methods have succeeded in overawing the statesmen of different countries, intimidating the leaders of at least some of the magnificent armies; but happily they have not succeeded in breaking the spirit of the whole of the people in these countries.

So what is the position in Germany? The Germans—not so much the ordinary working folk of Germany, certainly not the Trade Unionists that we knew before the Nazis destroyed them, but what we may describe as the German ruling classes (militarists, the ruling families of Prussia

THE RIVAL PHILOSOPHIES

particularly, and certain others)—have now for a long time followed the philosophy that the only way there could be peace in the world was by Germany being the predominant ruler; that they could force what they called their culture and outlook down the throats of everyone else.

The attempt has now been made to set the clock back on Democracy. Well, I remember in dozens of Labor Conferences, in Trades Councils, and in branches, resolutions coming demanding that the executives should fight Fascism and fight Nazism, and denouncing appeasement or anything else. Nothing has been able to stop the conflict taking place. By the logic of events these two great issues have come into conflict, and now one or other must triumph. I could criticize this or that action of this or that Government, but the position I had to face was that if Nazism triumphed, then every form of working class organization in this country was abolished the moment the triumph of Nazism came to this country. Every Cooperative Movement, every Trade Union Movement, every form of progressive organization in this country would have its death knell sounded the very moment that Nazism could announce a triumph. You cannot remain neutral in a struggle of this character. Neither can you, at the dictates of anyone else, apart from your own conscience, allow your action to be determined. Therefore I make no apologies for answering the call, to do what I could to help to achieve a victory in this war and doing my damnedest to beat Nazism.

What is the position at the present moment? No one wanted war in this country. No one was looking for whom they could devour. In fact, the denunciation of Chamber-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

lain was because he tried to avoid war. He did not accept the challenge of Hitler. In the days of Chamberlain, resolutions came to the Executive denouncing us at every turn because we did not have a revolution the next morning! There was nothing in the character of the British people urging them to attack anybody; they were willing to pay a very big price for peace rather than enter such a struggle. But why is it, now the struggle has been launched, that notwithstanding what our citizens are going through there is not a sign of a defeatist spirit from one end of the country to the other?

Whatever may have been the motives of those who tried appeasement, it can be truly said that the policy was bound to fail because these two great principles, one of force and the other of liberty, are irreconcilable; and if Europe, at the close of what is virtually a civil struggle, is to take her part again as the great center of culture, economic knowledge and even finance in rebuilding the world, then we in this country have to see to it that we are not influenced only by questions of geography or what has been described as vital interests—the term “vital interests” being expressed in communications, spheres of development or even raw materials.

We have to go deeper, first to triumph and then to place the principles of peace higher than anything else, or we shall have condemned another generation to renew the struggle, because I am convinced that in the evolution of mankind one or other of these principles must survive; that is to say, we must be free men and women, or slaves,

THE RIVAL PHILOSOPHIES

and as long as the issue remains unsettled recurring conflict is inevitable.

One of the first things that goes under Nazi domination is our own Trade Union Movement, the Cooperative Movement, and every other progressive movement; everybody has to submit to the domination of a small clique at the top. On the other hand, I take the view that self-government must, if it is to survive in the centuries to come, rest for its strength, its resources, and its rights upon the power of the people, and that the issue of war, life, and death itself must in every country be taken out of the hands of any small oligarchy, military clique, or group of politicians, and must be determined in the end, if Freedom and Democracy are to survive, by placing it in the hands of the people.

The conception of life of our opponents is that the human being can be made an automaton, that he can be drilled, ordered, and supervised by a Gestapo, and his soul cannot be his own. That doctrine of force has been in existence for many years; but the doctrine of force has to be superseded by the doctrine of reason, understanding and equality. I am not prepared to be a party to any society which says to the individual: "You must be a slave." The British Trade Union Movement from its earliest days has been struggling to emerge and emancipate itself from that position, and in the last half-century it has made tremendous progress. The end is not yet, but it is on its way.

This struggle in Europe, therefore, resolves itself very largely into what is almost a civil war, a war between two ideologies, a war which, however much our predecessors

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

may have attempted to avoid it by appeasement and compromise, has come through the sheer logic of events; and there cannot be a settlement until one or other of these principles—liberty or slavery—triumphs in the end.

We in this country, for now more than a hundred years, have believed that the road to the highest achievements of civilization and human attainment lies in the expansion of freedom and, even before Labor was represented as it is today, or even hoped to achieve actual power, there was a growing recognition, as a result of the agitation of economists, philosophers, statesmen and early Trade Union leaders, that the future security of Britain lay in two directions. One was in the development of the right of self-government in the highest sense, which means the right of a people to determine such matters as its life and death, the determining of their defense and even war itself, and which was incorporated in both the exercise of franchise and the placing of taxation for such purposes on the individual responsibility. The second was the right of the masses of the people to develop independent and free organizations. I do not deny that in the beginning it was a minority in the State that held that view and it resulted in a good many historic struggles before the majority accepted it and it was incorporated in what is now known as the British Commonwealth.

And looking at Europe as an entity, what else can it have been that caused the present grim conflict but the fighting out as to which of these great principles—liberty or slavery—should be the ruling factor for the constitution of governments and development of peoples? It was assumed that

THE RIVAL PHILOSOPHIES

this great principle had been established in the last war, but I am afraid there had been such a long period since the previous struggle that those responsible both for the conduct and the settlement of that war failed to realize that, underneath, the survival of one of these principles was at stake. There is no doubt that it was not so much the establishment of this or that country or the creation of the boundaries drawn in the Versailles Treaty that led us into this present struggle. That was the pretext. It was the failure to base the settlement of the World War on the definite acceptance of the really fundamental principle that the government should be responsible to the people.

I think I have made it clear that what we are up against is not merely Hitler or Goering, for having watched the development from the last war until now and the whole trend of German policy towards domination, I am satisfied that if there had been no Hitler they would have invented an automaton for the purpose of raising this spirit of aggression with the object of achieving their end by war and plunder. Indeed, I was particularly interested in a speech of Goebbels as far back as 1929, when he developed the theory of the necessity of fighting communism, and how they must organize Germany to fight Russia; so whether it was a matter of us in the West or Russia in the East, the fact is that the mind of the Prussian is set on rape and plunder and dominating other races the whole time. Europe and the world can never have peace until Germany has learned finally that her philosophy of gangsterism cannot succeed.

This task, however, is a colossal undertaking. The devel-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

opment of events is producing a battlefield from Britain practically over the whole continent of Europe to the Middle East, and the burden in the main has to be borne by us alone—by a gallant and brave people fighting for its future existence and the preservation of the soul of mankind; and when I say a people, I mean a united people.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the struggles of the people I have represented have been hard and severe; that they have suffered unemployment and often distasteful legislation; but on the other hand, we can set off against those things the fact that we have, as a working people, made more progress in the last half-century than any other similar people in the world, and most of the great reforms that have been accomplished have had their genesis in the ordinary desires of the common people. Various parties may have passed the legislation, different statesmen may have contributed, but any student of history would do well to look through the records of the great Trade Union Congress, and there they would find for the last seventy-odd years resolution after resolution expressing the urge and desire for education, for legislation on health, for unemployment pay, for State action in this and that and the other direction, for the widening of the franchise and the development of self-government; and slowly but surely it has been woven into the fabric of the constitution and economic life of this Commonwealth. We have not achieved our ultimate end, and the road may still be long, but I am not prepared to sacrifice the things we have achieved nor to deviate from the path we have set ourselves to travel. It has been an upward but an onward march, and we have succeeded

THE RIVAL PHILOSOPHIES

over the century in creating a broad way from the cottage to the highest places in the land. Obstacle after obstacle has been removed and now, at this period of our history, there is a danger of a complete lapse into reaction and barbarism, to undo all the mighty and wonderful achievements; and in order to undo them, I repeat, one of the first institutions Hitler and Mussolini would destroy would be the independent and free organizations of the working people, as they did in Germany and Italy.

Let then this lesson be learned—that which is worth having is worth fighting for, and that which is fought for and won and woven into the fabric of the State by democratic methods is more likely to be lasting.

In my mind the fact was, and still is, that the Commonwealth ideal, on the basis of equality, must be the basic principle of the future security and prosperity of the world. What I hoped was that many people would have considered the problem from the point of view of whether such a change might have been capable of realization without war and whether what the Prime Minister has described as the “blood and tears” that have to be spent could have been averted. Instead of conflict, cooperation might have been developed, for I am quite satisfied that if at any moment there had been a genuine desire on the part of Germany really to put aside her philosophy of domination and accept the principle of cooperation, this country would have responded. There had become ingrained in the British people a real detestation of war; and the mood of political democracy, world-wide, was undergoing such a change that if there had not been jerked into European politics this idea

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

of achieving the end by aggression instead of by patience and adjustment, much progress by this time could have been made. For in the history of the world the time between the last war and this one is extremely short; the acceptance of the principle of revision, readjustment and peaceful endeavor was growing and a little patience sometimes can avoid a terrible conflict.

It was said at the end of the Boer War that when Kitchener had to persuade Botha and that great statesman and general, Smuts, to agree to the proposed terms of peace, Smuts and Botha were doubtful about putting their names to the treaty, because at the end of such a conflict there was mistrust; and it is said that Kitchener said, "Don't you know that the democratic complex in Britain is constantly on the change? There will be an election in a short time and those will be in power who will give back the liberty you have lost." Smuts and Botha accepted that, and it is to the credit of Great Britain that in the fullness of time Campbell-Bannerman was returned to office and we redeemed our pledge to give back to South Africa greater freedom and union than had been lost. Such a development was also possible on the continent of Europe. The Versailles Treaty may have been good or it may have been bad; some of it may have been worthy of preserving, but—I can speak for the heart of the British people—there was no antagonism to a policy of adjustment and revision and at attempts being made stage by stage to help to develop better standards of living and greater human association. But instead of allowing peaceful endeavor to grow and develop healthily, all kinds of methods were adopted. Artificial unem-

THE RIVAL PHILOSOPHIES

ployment was created—all the unemployment that preceded this war was not genuine; it was not based on pure economic disorder. It is possible and easy to achieve a political objective in order to make the common people feel that war or some drastic step has to be taken—for those in power and in control to use that power to create artificial conditions in order to produce a definite political result. I venture to suggest that the six million unemployed in Germany prior to the coming in of Hitler was to a very large extent created by the great financial and vested interests of Krupps and Thyssens, with a view to bringing about a definite political result. Then the workpeople were led to believe that, with the change, unemployment could be solved. How has it been solved but by making weapons of destruction and making a trade of killing their fellow men, by the destruction of liberty, and by the attempt to dominate the soul? But that is not our conception of the solution that has got to be found ultimately for the economic problems of our civilization.

The great task that will lie before us when this war is finished is how to wipe out poverty and misery and unemployment by constructive effort and without resorting to the artificial means of destruction.

It is the knowledge, deep in the hearts of the British people, and I believe in the hearts of our Allies, that Germany would accept no settlement and meant war in any case, that explains the magnificent response to the war effort in this and other countries.

I was one of those who, on more than one occasion, ventured to prophesy that Germany and Russia would come

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

together. For the last six or seven years it was deep-rooted in my mind that in carrying out what is called tactics, that would be the result. I think it is a mistake on the part of nations to overrate tactics and underestimate principles. But though that was my view, I am not so sure now that even those men in the Kremlin are not grateful to the British Air Force, the British Navy and the British Army at this particular moment. The day may yet come, and indeed may come quickly—while there may be maneuverings at the moment like two men in a clinch afraid to break away in case they hit each other, and while that situation may go on for a time—when I can see a new reorientation coming. I can visualize that by our very strength, by our power and, on the other hand, through the needs of Germany to break every agreement still further in a drive for food and for oil, Hitler will take the plunge against his erstwhile friends.

We have, I repeat, preached international collaboration, cooperation, collective security. Put against that an article from the Decalogue of the Fascist League published in the London *Times* at the time of the Abyssinian crisis. In Article 10 of that Decalogue it says: "At the first crackle of musketry the blackshirt will see again the fearful figure of the Duce. He will see it thrown against the background of the sky beyond the enemy like a gigantic vision of a war-like dream. At that vision the blackshirts, terrible and splendid, will crush every resistance, bombs in their hands, daggers between their teeth and a sovereign contempt for danger in their hearts."

That is the commandment that has been taught to the

THE RIVAL PHILOSOPHIES

young Fascists from their childhood. This is the philosophy upon which they have been reared—hatred and war; but I am sure it will prove that the less rhetorical but more humane and deeper spiritual philosophy of the Beatitudes will produce a race stronger in conviction, mightier in battle and victorious in the end; and will prove to the world that love of liberty, right relationship and deep conviction will provide stouter hearts than anything that can spring from that which I have quoted from the Fascist Decalogue.

10

ALLIES AND FRIENDS

WE CANNOT be unmindful of the emotions and feelings of our Allies and friends throughout the world, when their countries were devastated, their territory lost and their institutions passed under the domination of the enemy. We can understand the feelings of Czechoslovakia—a great democratic State—the stanchest ally of our democratic cause, which can never be really suppressed; Poland, whose men have sat at the same table with us at the Internationals; Finland, which had carried out the great task of reconstruction. Norway must also feel it as keenly as any, because there is not a stancher democratic trade union movement than that of our Scandinavian friends, not one more liberal, more generous, more willing to pour out its resources, not only for its members but to help others in any part of the world. The Dutch too; the Danes, Belgians and French. No, we are not unmindful of their emotions. They lost their territory, their homes, and have come under the heel of the enemy. Their very souls must writhe under it—those who have not had the chance of escaping and those who have escaped must resent the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

fact that the resources and skill of their countries are being used to the detriment of the forces of freedom which Britain and her Allies represent. I have no doubt the day will soon come when the great masses of these countries will find an opportunity to refuse the use of their skill in industrial production to defeat their own comrades—the working classes in the allied countries.

Anybody could have understood Greece giving way. We could apply it to ourselves in Wales—an army of millions with tanks and airplanes—just over the Monmouthshire border—saying to us: “Let us pass through or we shall slaughter you”—and assume we had only a few divisions to defend ourselves. But in spite of that, Greece stood up to it.

Just as in the Army, Navy and Air Force there are a great loyalty and a great comradeship in the task to be done, every man trusting the other to carry out his duty and to accomplish his purpose, have we not got an industrial army with an equal loyalty, such as Hitler cannot produce? And have we not another army in Poland, in Holland, in France? Is there not still burning within their souls, a desire to overthrow the spoiler of their land; a desire to win back their freedom? And in Norway there is that great spirit of the Scandinavian, producing one of the finest trade unionisms in the world; marvelous people, who always responded to every call with a great comradeship better even than some of our own people in the international movement. Hitler may have his 250,000,000 people, but we have a great unity within and a great enmity to work against him in his own country. That is what we

ALLIES AND FRIENDS

have to harness. I mentioned that in the United States there was a fatalistic view that we were beaten. Well, we have changed that, and we have something to be proud of.

We are proud of the exploits and courage of the Polish Navy, Army, Air Force and Mercantile Marine, and, indeed, we know that though the enemy has taken their territory and imposed their will upon it, they have not conquered Poland and the Polish people. No race in the world has suffered more than they from the attempts at domination by others, and no race in the world has preserved its spirit in spite of these attacks as they have done. We watched with sympathy and with pride the way they defended their country.

We knew in those short weeks that it was not courage they lacked; it was the means of defense, and if they had had those means the story of the course of this war might have been entirely different.

The defense of Warsaw will represent an epic story in history, and it may well be that the city will become the Mecca of those whose watchword is "Liberty"; and just as we are proud of their heroic stand and the marvelous courage of their Forces, so today we welcome into the industrial ranks and into the field of production their scientists, their engineers, their skill, their labor and their sailors, knowing only too well that they will, with equal zest, make their contribution to production so as to add to the common pool; equipment for our common Forces who are engaged in the united task of ridding the world of this pest of aggression.

Indeed, more is being done: the creation of the International Labor Force, on terms of equality, will, I believe,

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

have a very big influence in the greater conception of unity when the peace comes to be made. Out of the terrible travail through which we are now passing, may it not well be that by this and other acts, we are forging bonds between us that can never be broken, and that the spirit that has united us now, in this great effort, will produce more than a strategic arrangement?

This war, having touched the civilian, the homes, the wives and families of both our peoples, has created an understanding of what war really means, what aggression means, and how—if it is to be finally defeated forever—every one of us who has suffered must band together for all time in a great comradeship to prevent it ever raising its ugly head again.

Something else is happening too. The people of the United States are awakened. Their wealth, their skill, their labor and capacity are rapidly being brought into the common pool for the common cause. And while the Poles in the industrial field in Britain may be small in numbers, they are but the spearhead of a large army of fellow countrymen engaged in the great productive enterprises of the United States who will, I am sure, with the spirit of Poland within them, with the love of liberty coursing in their veins, contribute to the maximum to help them and us in freeing their country again from the dictatorship of the oppressors. As others have failed to break the Poles, so the gangsters who now dominate their country cannot succeed. How stupid these people, these Germans, really are! Can they never learn from history, that they cannot break the spirit of Poland? It cannot be done and all great powers have got to

ALLIES AND FRIENDS

learn this truth: great as they are, powerful as they may be, they are weak if their power rests on the oppression of others and the denial of liberty to smaller nations. The size of a nation does not determine its greatness, its contribution to literature, culture and civilization. It is character that does that, and indeed for that great character to have its chance it must be nurtured in an atmosphere which is free from fear, free from domination.

We send our greetings to our oppressed comrades in Poland today and desire them to know and feel that if their resistance was broken by an overwhelming force we prize that resistance. We shall not forget it. We shall fight on until liberty and justice are re-established in the world.

We know how France must resent being under the conqueror's yoke—France always held the light of liberty high; freedom of discussion and the rights of association were the very breath of her existence. Much of the liberty we are now fighting to retain and which the Nazis would destroy was inspired by her. The French always were an inspiration to every international effort. I am sure their hearts are gladdened when they learn of the resistance the working people of Britain are offering against Nazi domination, and we are confident that when the opportunity presents itself they will be back with their British working class comrades, determined yet again to be free and to play their part in the struggle for the economic emancipation of the people.

Hitler has tried to browbeat us by heavy bombing, de-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

struction of our homes, slaughter of women and children. He thinks that his great mechanized forces can dominate the world and thereby impose the Prussian will and servitude upon the masses. He will not succeed. We shall have many hard blows to take yet. We know that, but we are determined not only to save ourselves but to fight on so that France can be so re-established that it can play its proper part in the great work of constructive civilization.

In the meantime, then, let France help the fight for freedom all she can. Surely it can never be laid at the door of the members of the working classes of France that they helped the despot; that they produced goods and munitions to destroy the free working class movements of Great Britain, her Allies, and the other democratic countries. We believe better of them than that. We know they have the courage to resist.

The working classes of Britain have accepted an intense form of mobilization of labor; of producing night and day. Our soldiers are fighting with a heroic courage; our Navy and our airmen are putting up a splendid show. There is no spirit of surrender. Every time we are attacked it hardens our hearts and increases our determination to fight on.

Let our friends, then, take heart and courage. Let them organize wherever they can. Everything that they can do to aid the great cause of freedom will be welcome and they will have the satisfaction of knowing that they are striking a blow at the tyrant's heart.

I am satisfied that the day is not far distant when the international organizations will again meet to carry on, and then it will be in a new economic field where the construc-

ALLIES AND FRIENDS

tive genius of our people will get full play and where the rights of man will be established in such strength that they will be beyond challenge by any dictator.

Whatever may be said of the British Empire, however it was got—and I cannot make my office in the Government retrospective—whatever may be said, Britain for the last hundred years has been—you may say not fast enough, but it has been—expanding self-government. Self-government has been extended to Canada, Australia, New Zealand; and perhaps one of the greatest epochs in history was when Campbell-Bannerman gave it back to South Africa. It has been extended to a portion of Ireland, which during this war at this moment exercises a right—which she has a right to do—to remain neutral. India has obtained the largest measure of self-government granted at one time in its history, and the policy of this Government at this moment is that if the difficulties can be surmounted—and they are not easy in a great country of 400,000,000 with all the racial, religious, and other difficulties—the policy in relation to India is to extend responsible self-government as speedily as ever we can.

If there is one thing Hitler miscalculated, it is that he thought the granting of liberty to our Dominions and the beginning of the new Constitution in India meant the break-up of the power of the British Empire. He has made a great mistake. Germany is now beginning to learn that liberty gives greater ties and greater solidarity than any centralized organization or machine can possibly do. We

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

want to continue that work, in Africa, and in other parts of the world. We must do it and we have to stop Hitler preventing us doing it.

India is becoming industrialized. She has got to have a mechanized army. We do not know whether an attack will be made upon her. We have got to watch. So she has to have industrial development. The question was what standard and basis of training should be introduced, and I proposed to the India Office and to the Cabinet that we should adopt two methods. One was that we should bring workingmen, Indians, over to England and train them here; let them learn our standards; let them learn our methods. They will have facilities by lectures which they have never had before. They will be taught the administration of British Trade Unionism. In addition, we are going to arrange, I hope, for good Trade Union instructors to go out to India, so that, equally, out there it will not merely be a question of teaching them how to produce wealth, but to have the facilities for teaching their students British methods and standards. I believe that this is a small but important step to begin the elevation, on a basis of stability, of the Indian workman such as has never been tried before, and I am very glad to have had the opportunity of getting these arrangements made.

One vexed problem that has concerned me is the provision of accommodation for Indian seamen. I said that I was not going, as far as I could help it, to allow to creep in again into any document the use of the word "lascar." They are Indian seamen. It is the term "lascar" which has had such a depreciating effect on their wage standards, and

ALLIES AND FRIENDS

I am convinced if, in international legislation, they are treated on a different basis there will be a new conception in the approach to this question. It is like the old way of always calling everybody a laborer and only calling him something else when his wages are a penny an hour more. Nobody did more than I did to get rid of the term "laborer"—by eliminating it from every agreement I signed—and to get them graded upwards, which makes a lot of difference. The next thing is, I hope the day has come when, as regards India itself, the British workman and everybody else will give up the practice of referring to Indians as "coolies," because associated with the word is inferiority, and I think the sooner it is wiped out the better.

The free peoples of the British Commonwealth will go down in history from now on, not as an imperialist Empire, but as a determined people who at a critical moment in world history stood between tyranny and liberty and triumphed. The war has produced a comradeship throughout the British Commonwealth. Whatever tendency there might have been to regard ourselves as separate entities, Hitler put an end to all that and knitted us together in a glorious common cause.

One gets a marvelous thrill to see the Canadian boys here standing on guard waiting to repel the invader should he dare to attack. It is difficult to find words to express the thankfulness inspired by this great act on the part of the sons of Canada for the preservation of the British family of nations.

The other day we welcomed the pilots who had been

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

trained over the plains and hills of Canada, coming to take their place in the front line for the defense of civilization. Then added to this was the splendid speech of the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, telling us of the tremendous increase in their armed forces and the output of every kind of equipment from their factories, which together with their response to their war savings campaign is no mean contribution to the great objective.

I had the great advantage of paying a visit to Australia in 1938, and in addition to touring through its vast spaces, meeting friends and making many lasting friendships, I attended the British Commonwealth Relations Conference at Sydney as well as meeting many labor friends in the different states and at Canberra. During that period the war clouds hung over Europe and indeed over the world. The friends seemed to be bewildered; the issues were clouded; there was a great feeling that the men and money that had been spent just twenty years before had been all to no purpose. The issues were confused with the question as to whether the right thing had been done in the peace treaties; whether the correct boundary had been drawn establishing the State of Czechoslovakia, and many people, including members of our party to the British Commonwealth Relations Conference, were advocating a readjustment of such boundaries and allowing those of German nationality and descent to be incorporated in the Reich in the belief that such a step would save another war. Keen debates were taking place as to the attitude that should be adopted by the different parts of the Commonwealth should Britain herself be involved in another European struggle. The dis-

ALLIES AND FRIENDS

cussions that took place were a little disturbing and seemed to miss the real point at issue, but underneath it all I had a feeling of confidence that if Germany ever did throw down the challenge to the Democracies it would be resolutely fought out and that the British Commonwealth would stand as one great unity in defense of all freedom. The heart-searching that took place at that time was good, because it revealed that we were not entering into a struggle blindly. It really, after all, represented an attempt on everybody's part at self-examination and an endeavor to ascertain whether we were following the right course. It was clear everywhere throughout the British Commonwealth that there was danger of war and that there was a genuine feeling that if it were possible to avoid it by taking even a generous line toward others that would preserve peace, this ought to be taken. It is therefore to us in Great Britain, who have now to bear the brunt of this struggle, a matter of congratulation that this association of free people has stood the test and the great response from all over the Commonwealth is the best evidence that the forces of freedom can defeat tyranny.

The Labor Movement in England was never in doubt. We knew that the issue was not Czechoslovakia or Austria or any question of frontiers; it was the uprising of a mighty reactionary force in Germany that was determined to destroy every element of liberty and certainly every principle for which the Labor Movement stood, and, indeed, to wipe us out of existence together with every other progressive Movement.

I feel that it is not asking too much to ask our fellow

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

workers in Australia to do their utmost in the field of production. They have sent their men—we are grateful; they must be equipped not merely adequately, but with overwhelming force. They can carry on production in Australia in absolute safety. They do not have to suffer air attack or take any physical risk, but every ounce of extra energy put out, every extra steel bullet they produce or shell they turn or airplane they complete or ship they build is shortening this war and is a contribution to the ending of this awful nightmare and tyranny. I know that the Australian workmen, like us, are people of great independence. No one can drive them, but they will respond to a lead. They are generous—that's typical of the working people—and if they were here I know the temper they would meet Hitler's bombing in. I know the remarks they would pass, the adjective they would probably use. They have the temper and the spirit to avenge the deaths of all those who have been killed here, to put an end to tyranny and threats and insecurity. They are great lovers of democratic rights. They will give of the utmost energy and will demonstrate that those who have died have not died in vain. They will have contributed to bring liberty back to the millions of the toiling masses throughout Europe and, what is more, they will have prevented the chains of slavery being fastened upon the peoples of the world. Travel and communication have made this planet so small, so dangerous, that it becomes ever more imperative that peace, liberty and social justice are made indivisible. On that footing I appeal to my Australian comrades to join with the British Trade Unionists and working people to strike the greatest blow we have ever

ALLIES AND FRIENDS

jointly had the opportunity of striking for the freedom of the masses throughout the world.

In the Western Hemisphere you have developed and had your being on the basis of democracy. So strong were these principles that you could have frontiers that were disarmed, you could keep your armed forces at an absolute minimum, almost limited, for many years, to a number just sufficient to preserve internal order. The separate Governments or peoples found a way to live together in peace. This may have been due to the fact that those who founded the United States and Canada were the men and women who had left the old countries and in those souls, even in those days, burned fiercely this love of freedom. Accordingly, every institution you devised worked as a check against possible domination and, at the same time, allowed a great unity, based on liberty, to grow.

There is a great deal of talk about inflation and deflation which the ordinary person possibly does not understand. To put the case in simple language, it is this: our people in Great Britain today are entitled to social services, such as old age pensions, unemployment benefit and all kinds of health services. These are fixed in terms of our currency of so many shillings per week, as the case may be. If you tried to capitalize that sum in a commercial sense it would run into millions. These services are rights of the people to the common purse; and being a right to the common purse, we are determined to try and prevent a reduction in the value that the State has undertaken to pay to maintain our sick,

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

our aged and those dependent upon it. In addition, we have asked the public to contribute their resources to winning this war. They contributed last year, mainly by small savings, over two billion dollars. They have been given savings certificates and we are determined to try to maintain the value of those savings certificates. They will represent a mighty credit for reconstruction at the end of the war.

It would be well to remind those from other countries that Britain is one of the greatest trading centers in the world, and if the value of this currency and service is maintained and our purchasing power is kept stable, then it means there is a quicker free flow of trade immediately hostilities cease; because if the purchasing power of Britain and its exchange is maintained you establish a proper equilibrium.

I emphasize that because it links up with that great idea put out by President Roosevelt in the method he has suggested to contribute to the war effort: he lends goods and we repay in goods. It is a great idea. It goes further than helping to win the war now; it takes us out of the hands of speculators in money at the end of the war. It allows us to repay by labor and by effort and it is an indication that he accepts the view that the greatest contribution to international stability at the end of this war is labor and effort and not speculation and the manipulation of mere currencies. Therefore I ask you to see that behind these conceptions of our endeavoring to maintain stability while engaged in this grim struggle, with the cooperation of President Roosevelt, and his wise and very long view as shown by this decision,

ALLIES AND FRIENDS

there are two contributing factors: to help us to win the war and to produce stability at the end of the war.

I am sure it is accepted by the people in the United States, just as it is in Great Britain and in the British Commonwealth of Nations, that the health and progressive state of society depends upon the proper functioning of democracy, a conception which allows for the spiritual urge that is within man to express and translate itself into the cultural and economic life of the country. It accepts the doctrine that the maintenance of a healthy life and co-operation between peoples and nations must depend upon the use of reason and not force; and when the spirit of dictatorship and aggression seeks to prevent the use of reason and destroy the normal relationship between peoples, then it must be met by stubborn resistance and unity of purpose in order that it may be checked and the thing itself finally destroyed.

The Prussian policy is the very antithesis of that of the United States itself. You are a great, wealthy and powerful people, but in spite of that you have not used that power to crush your neighbors in the American continent. What has been so very encouraging in the evolution of your relationships has been the growth of the policy of good neighborliness, one which has encouraged every lover of the rights of man all over the world. It stands out as such a tremendous contrast to the conception of Prussian militarism and domination. Equally, within the British Commonwealth and with the races that go to make it up, the whole tendency for the last hundred years has been to enable self-government to be established, even to bring the peoples to such a stage of

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

development that they become capable of administering their own affairs.

Is it not true, too, that both you and we have been working for a number of years on the basis that the prosperity of one nation cannot be firmly secured by the impoverishment of another? We are convinced that the right way to a correct equilibrium is to raise the standard of living and to expand the rights of free association. Britain has been willing, largely on the initiative of Labor, to collaborate in order to find a correct method to distribute the raw materials of the world so that they would contribute to the abolition of poverty. This decision was proclaimed by successive statesmen, not in the name of a party but in the name of the whole British Commonwealth.

We have this in common, that we both dreamed of a better world and we strove internationally to achieve it, but our efforts, together with those of others, have been thwarted by the injection of the Nazi war policy into the body politic of Europe and the world. We have not lost our faith in the possibility of establishing sound social conditions for the people of the world. We have been just turned aside from this great work for the moment. It is rather as if people of a city, carrying on their daily tasks, were suddenly struck by a foul disease. The people set aside their normal efforts, they have even to allow much that was on hand to wait over for a later day, and direct the whole of their energies to fighting and stamping out the disease which if allowed to go unchecked would destroy them. Like an epidemic, this beastly war spirit of Germany has caused a world upheaval twice in a quarter of a century.

ALLIES AND FRIENDS

It may be at this moment that Britain and her Allies are in the front line fighting the battle, but we are only the front line. Everyone in the world is involved on one side or the other. His sympathies and thoughts leave no room for neutrality: there can be no neutrality between wrong and right; and his contribution, when he has decided which side he is on, will be of inestimable value. If the weight of those who are accepting the right is thrown behind the cause of liberty it will have the effect of stimulating and maintaining the ever-increasing feeling of confidence. Feelings will not merely be expressed in thought, but in material, credit and wealth, which are so essential to achieve triumph in the shortest possible time and thereby allow the great task of reconstruction to begin.

It is on the basis of example and not precept that we ask those in other countries who have within them the same desire as we have for the victory of our principles, to co-operate with us. The form and method of that cooperation must be determined by them, but we are determined to go to the last penny and the last ounce of effort to resist aggression; and what will it profit anyone who, on any pretext, withholds either his wealth, skill or energy and loses the battle of liberty in consequence?

Our hearts are full of gratitude at the great response that has been forthcoming.

Do we not want to fill the hearts of the teeming millions now being enslaved with hope for the day of deliverance? And what better hope can be given than to let them know

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

that throughout the world where free men and women can exist and have their being, efforts are being directed every hour and every minute to working and striving to send the necessary means for deliverance? Let them hear the resounding answer in the roar from the planes built in your factories, the guns, the ships and the full resources of your production—all poured out to assist in bringing nearer that great day when free men and women can sit round the table and say, “We have made a common endeavor to save the soul of mankind.” On that day, after triumph over the forces of aggression, free men and women can set to work to build a new world order, whose foundation shall be social security and liberty. Upon that foundation will be given to the sons of men a chance to build an edifice worthy of the sacrifice that has been made to win it, which will represent a purer, higher and nobler civilization.

11

FORWARD, DEMOCRACY!

DEMOCRACY must move forward. Throughout history the great struggle of mankind has been to establish liberty, both political and economic. The question to which we must now direct our attention is as to whether or not what we ourselves know as Democracy offers the best opportunity for the human to evolve to the higher state. We all, I assume, accept the view that we have only touched the fringe of possible development of humanity and human society.

In the struggle for liberty there must always be conflict of forces, and such freedom as we now enjoy in the democracies has been achieved by a variety of methods. In my own country it was won after bitter struggles through the ages, wrenched from the absolute power of kings, from the aristocracy and plutocracy until, finally, the political power rests upon the community as a whole, distributed equally between the sexes by means of universal suffrage. The most convenient method for democracy to express itself in Great Britain was to use the representative method and to adapt to its purpose the parliamentary form of government, which

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

originally was created as an aristocratic institution. In France the democratic state was achieved by the process of revolution, whilst in the United States of America, due to its revolt against the old world government, it was established with the creation of the State itself. In other parts of the world where self-government has been established it has been introduced coincident with the creation of the new states.

One of the great difficulties experienced by democracy in taking deep root has been in Central Europe, and Germany particularly. This has been due to the fact that whilst in nearly every other country democracy was extended and expanded following the Industrial Revolution, there the feudal princes continued after the industrial development: democracy only came with defeat and revolution in 1918, but its survival was made almost impossible by the difficulties with which it had to contend not only from within but without, and which have resulted in its temporary eclipse.

Mankind has ever been conscious that if order is to be preserved some form of government must obtain. It must have organized means at its disposal to make laws, administer justice, direct the affairs of the country and determine the relationships which shall exist with other peoples and, generally, to institute such forces as will provide proper security and enable the citizen to live in proper relationship with his fellow citizens. At the same time, with a view to

FORWARD, DEMOCRACY!

preserving the right of the citizen against Executive and State authority, which they themselves have created and elected, to devise means to hold the Government to strict accountability to the electorate and to make provision by means of political machinery to remove a government when desired and to make it possible for public opinion to determine the course a government must follow. In other words, to make the Will of the people supreme. To achieve this there must be freedom of speech, of the press and other forms of expression. It is expressed clearly in the historical phrase: "Government of the people, for the people, by the people."

From time to time the rights of man have been resisted or challenged by the military caste, dictators and others who believe they can govern more effectively if only the liberty of the people is destroyed, than the people can govern themselves through their democratic institutions. Sometimes, as at present, this challenge comes from outside, at other times it comes from inside. But it is rather striking that the driving force for liberty has always been strongest when tyranny and uncontrolled authority have held sway. Whether that authority has been exercised by monarchs; dictators; superabundance of wealth; property or capital; or has rested upon military power, in each period a situation has arisen when the struggle between tyranny and liberty has had to be fought out. However much we may try to avoid the war of ideologies, in my view one or other must ultimately triumph. I submit therefore the following points for consideration:

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

1. Do we, in fact, believe that for the evolution of mankind the democratic form of government is best?
2. If so, what are the handicaps to the maintenance of democracy?
3. Are we prepared to accept the necessity of not merely defending democracy but so to effectively develop and support it that it becomes the predominant condition throughout the world?

FIRST POINT

In answer to the first point: I take the view that no one has yet found any alternative method which provides an easier, more just or equitable form of government than democracy has provided. Let us examine it. Democracy is rather a state or condition that has been devised by the body politic to allow for change by consent, that is, upon the decision of the majority of its citizens without having to resort to force or the indulgence in tyranny. It must be remembered that when a nation is founded upon a democratic basis it gives an opportunity for other free institutions to survive and to make their contribution to those whom they seek to serve, and to the State. Hence it is significant that in every dictatorship which has been brought into existence recently the first institutions to be destroyed have been those which were created for the defense of the workers, such as trade unions, cooperative societies and various cultural bodies.

We must not confuse democracy with the maintenance

FORWARD, DEMOCRACY!

of a particular form of economic or financial system, rather is it a condition which allows for change of the system itself and provides for such adaptation as the change in public need and opinion demands. Hence if the system is incapable of adequately providing the people with food; clothing; shelter and the necessary amenities and opportunities for full development, democracy can by the act of election of those who favor another system, or modification of a given system, provide an opportunity for so doing.

It will no doubt be argued that, notwithstanding the freedom of opportunity to change, there will be minorities of vested interests in a State or in the world who by force of their economic power will prevent the change taking place. But that is a task for the leader and educationalist to attune the character and mind of the citizen to be ready at all times to make the democratic will prevail. In any case, I do not accept the view that these minorities can prevent change, although they can hinder and delay.

The democratic system provides, too, the greatest opportunity for blending acute racial difficulties into one political whole. It is the one system by which it has been found possible to bring together races from all over the world, providing them with liberty of expression and at the same time welding them into one great people. But such races must place a curb upon themselves so that under no circumstances will they attempt to use their racial characteristics either to thwart or divert the proper exercise of democratic government, or seek to dominate other races.

Equally with religion, many religious struggles for supremacy and domination of whole peoples have taken

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

place in history, but real religion as distinct from the struggle for temporal power has thrived more successfully in democratic states where religious communities, whilst exercising their own rituals and believing their own theologies, have recognized the rights of others and not attempted to make any particular sect dominant in the State. For example, in the British Commonwealth where races are segregated in different countries, each in different stages of development, with great geographical, religious and cultural diversities, it has been found possible to expand the commonwealth idea and yet maintain its unity. It does represent the real antidote and antithesis of the old rabid imperialism and domination.

In the wider sphere of relations with others, that is between country and country, democracy recognizes that the same rule of law which must govern the relationships between citizen and citizen must be accepted if peace and progress are to survive. Therefore government by consent means that the major part of your laws will not require police enforcement, resting as they do upon the consent of the people. There is therefore no need for espionage; intimidation; interference with family relationships; or the division of the family by setting member against member, in order to secure obedience to authority. This latter point stands out in striking contrast to the methods which have to be employed by totalitarian states and other forms of dictatorship in order to secure acquiescence to the decrees of dictators. I would emphasize that the maintenance of family life as a basic condition of a well-governed state is

FORWARD, DEMOCRACY!

vitally important. When children are made to spy upon their parents and vice-versa in order to serve the will of a government, it is bound in the end to be the undoing of the state itself.

It will be represented to me that, notwithstanding the progress of democratic expansion in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the economic problems have not been solved and that democracy has not been either swift or efficient enough to adapt itself to the changes necessary in the economic situation. But public action has mainly been limited to the political field. It is only of recent date that the need for collective action in the economic sphere has been accepted, and whilst democracy may be groping to find the correct way to grapple with these vast economic problems, I am confident it will find it without destroying human liberty. But that does involve the acquiring of greater knowledge by the democracies and a readiness to respond to the demands made upon them. This will largely rest upon those responsible for leadership and education.

I make the claim that with the extension of democracy, universal suffrage and the greater accountability on the part of governments to the people as a whole, there is a greater social conscience—more attuned to the necessity of devising means to use this great democratic instrument with a view to finding permanent remedies for maldistribution, malnutrition and poverty. Neither can we ignore the fact that public discussion of these problems has resulted in many of the best minds in the world devoting themselves to scientific research with the object of equipping the repre-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

sentative authorities of democracy with fuller knowledge and guidance to assist them in solving these vexed problems.

SECOND POINT

I am ready to acknowledge that democracy has had many handicaps, one of the greatest being the deficiencies in many of our educational systems. In some democratic countries they have perpetuated the caste concept. For example, when compulsory education was introduced into Britain it was said by some of those in authority that the object was to educate our "new masters," meaning that whilst the right to vote and education could no longer be withheld and a curriculum must be devised for the children of the masses to teach them it is their duty to serve, the education of the aristocratic or historical public schools—which have provided most of those who have held high governmental office in our country—has been to teach their pupils they were born to govern and control. Therefore whilst the principle of democracy was accepted the devices introduced prevented its full fructification in the life of the country.

But in the process of time that concept has been modified and the gaps between the two curriculums narrowed until today a broader basis exists from which the State can draw its ability. With this change this old parliamentarily governed country is becoming more conscious that if it is to survive it must draw its ability to govern and administer the affairs of the State from the widest possible field.

FORWARD, DEMOCRACY!

It is interesting to note how the country has handicapped itself by limiting opportunity to a selected few: In a survey prepared by Professor J. L. Gray and Pearl Moshinsky on "Ability and Opportunity in English Education," carried out in connection with 10,000 children in the public elementary schools and including children from all classes of workpeople, it is shown that 80 per cent of those examined were able and highly intelligent children. It is striking to note, however, that due to the economic circumstances of their parents less than 7 per cent were able to proceed to higher education in England.

These figures clearly demonstrate that one of the handicaps to a highly developed and intelligent democracy is the breaking off of education at the critical moment. I suggest it is not only a handicap but a loss to the body politic and to the world generally.

Although the percentage of elementary school children attending municipal schools who were able to have the benefit of higher education was found to be so low, the majority of the children of the moneyed classes proceeded to higher education and ultimately found their place either in the government, direction of the country or some other executive position. This demonstrates a lack of opportunity to the children of the workers to fit themselves to administer the affairs of the state and industry. I have not had an opportunity of closely studying the figures for other countries but I do not doubt that there is an economic problem affecting full educational development in all countries.

Another handicap has been an inherent fear by vested interests in the rise of the masses to power through dem-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

ocratic government, and this fear has been used by such interests with disastrous effects upon the middle and professional classes. Thus the way for dictatorships has been made easy and democracy instead of being nursed into strength has been undermined. What were the vested interests and forces which assisted in the destruction of democratic government and the rise of dictatorships: big business; the great financial interests; the advocates of the theory of world revolution; political clericalism; military caste, and the practice of certain racial interests who thought they could procure their own safety by bribing the enemies of democracy. Experience has shown, however, that dictatorship in any form is no respecter of interests; religion; political philosophy; cultural development; science or morality. Those who sought to save themselves from the rise of democratic responsibility by coquetting and intriguing with this monster have found themselves equally its victims and are now the inhabitants of concentration camps, prisons, etc. The failure of sections of the people to recognize the importance of democracy has handicapped its development, and in some countries has led to its eclipse.

Another handicap which hinders democracy both in achieving justice in its own state and in its approach to peace, is the inherent primitive fear of man. Fears which have prompted man to exercise his predatory instincts. It is understandable how primitive man and pioneers in the development of the world, driven by hunger, the desire to expand, striving for security, fighting man and beast, de-

FORWARD, DEMOCRACY!

veloped and perpetuated these traits. But now is the opportune time to remove those fears.

It is our duty to remove the handicaps and having demonstrated that democracy has it within its power to create and remove governments by vote; to secure change by consent; to secure religious equality; to provide ready opportunities for adaptation of any or all changes to its economic system, one is bound to acknowledge that this is a far preferable state of humanity in which to live than where you have to have purges, shootings, concentration camps and all the devices that totalitarianism and reaction have to provide.

But this compels me to ask whether we are teaching the supreme value of the vote! I have often tried to convey to the people with whom I am closely associated in the great trade union movement of Britain, the supreme necessity of appreciating the difference between the giving of a vote and the exercising of a vote. Whilst it is true the people have the final authority at elections it is necessary to develop ability to examine, judge, and arrive at a sound decision. In the past public opinion has largely been governed by intuition, but science has devised mighty weapons of propaganda which can be used to thwart or divert that which may be described as the intuitive commonsense of the people and cramp or almost destroy both the critical faculty and the ability to judge. In the words of one writer, "Whilst elections can be influenced by a slogan or a poster on the wall on the way to the voting place, so long must we confess that we have not an educated democracy." For it

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

must be remembered that when a citizen votes for a member to represent him in his legislative assembly he is, in fact, for a period putting into the hands of the person and the government he supports a tremendous power.

In my country we not only have to vote to make laws for ourselves but we have a colonial empire with sixty-six million people who are voteless. I am not now raising the question of the ownership of colonies but would point out that very often when a member is casting his vote in the British Parliament he may not only be determining the destinies of his own people and electors, but that of millions of others. For example, I watched with interest the extending of self-government to India, appreciating the enormous value and effect of the vote of a British member of parliament which day by day was being cast and was presumed to represent the opinion of thousands of electors in his constituency but did, in effect, determine the destiny of four hundred million people in that great country of India, with all its complexities and possibilities.

Therefore to ask a person to give a vote to this or that person is not enough, it is the exercise of his citizenship which is so important which also involves the supreme point of self-government in relation to other countries, states and people, and the determination of the issue of peace and war. That being so, it is important if self-government and democracy are to be effective that the actual power and responsibility of citizenship shall be understood by all citizens, and it is necessary to assist the citizen to build the right kind of mental defense to withstand the power of modern propaganda, and to develop a character

FORWARD, DEMOCRACY!

and initiative which will enable him to judge wisely the great issues involved. The vote and rights of citizenship are a great heritage and should be exercised with a great sense of responsibility and as a duty.

THIRD POINT

With regard to my third point, If we do accept the theory that democracy must be preserved can its defense be limited to one's own country regardless of what happens to it in the rest of the world? I have already asserted that one or other ideology must in the end triumph. Humanity must either lose its liberty or expand it. If this is accepted, how shall it be expanded? I have already indicated that the majority of the laws of a democratic country are operated by consent and without force, due to receiving the moral support of the citizen. For it is found that when a law has not got the moral support of a democratic people it seldom survives.

Is it not therefore essential to build up an equally strong international law with conscious moral support and consent behind it? International law as we have hitherto known it has rested upon a very narrow basis. It has been the code of kings, soldiers, sailors and diplomats and, notwithstanding that these great forces have sometimes had to fight for their country there were certain things which internationally even in war were regarded as wrong and taboo.

But can it be said that international law and morality have ever rested upon the knowledge, will and consent of the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

people? Diplomacy has to a great extent been secret and not communicated to the people as a whole. Narrow political circles have handled the relationships between the peoples of the many countries. In fact, the public themselves had come, until recent times, to regard the question of foreign relationships as being a matter for special treatment by a special class. But the world is changing. Communication and travel have made this planet so small and dangerous that the whole people have been brought into the discussion regarding relationships with other people, and a greater responsibility rests upon the citizen in his democratic capacity than has ever rested before.

The rapidity of communication has made it impossible to maintain the peace of the world except on the basis of liberty and a strong international moral sanction based upon the consent of the people and arrived at with their fullest knowledge. It is in this realm that democracy has its greatest task, and which is so urgent.

It is in this sphere, therefore, that I would urge democracy to move forward; for never amongst the citizens of the different countries was there less desire to dominate and never has there existed a greater will to find a just solution to both the political and economic problems which confront the peoples of the world, not merely amongst the great nations but equally amongst the smaller ones, for the size of the nation does not determine its value to the world. But the totalitarian states contend that to secure adjustment, racial exclusiveness must be established, their opponents persecuted or annihilated, and the whole exercise of freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of op-

FORWARD, DEMOCRACY!

portunity subordinated to the supreme will of a few men.

To accomplish this the whole direction of their organization has been to build up a powerful militarism, to block information to and from the outer world, to sloganize political life and indulge on every hand in suppression in order to maintain the power of the dictators. Against this there has not been matched a concentrated will on the part of those who stand for liberty and democracy. It is true certain nations are uniting to resist force as a means for settling disputes. They are asserting by superiority of arms to establish the rule of law and order; but if the rule of law rests upon superiority of arms and the security of vital interests alone, then it cannot be permanent. Democracy has to decide whether a system which provides for human rights and liberty is not a greater thing to defend than the geographical state in which we happen to be living. In fact by doing the greater we may secure the lesser. In a state no one is safe unless all are safe. In a world international law cannot function unless moral sanction is behind it and it applies equally to all. And that involves an examination as to whether democracy can provide a basis of justice for all the peoples of the world.

Can democracy, internationally, so act that the predominating and guiding principle that actuates it is justice? Can it successfully resist the totalitarian idea, with all its tyranny and assert its authority as a great moral and just force, so creating a higher state and giving to man his birth-right to live in decent security? Can it solve the problem of the "Have" and the "Have Nots," both within and without, and strive to secure economic justice? The supreme test for

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

democracy may come at any moment. The whole world has been driven, in order to resist aggression, to adopt a war economy. Events move quickly and instead of war breaking out Peace may break out, and the combined ability of the great democracies of the world will be needed equally in that event to secure justice, as it would to resist aggression by force. We must not act, when the aggressor has fallen, as though he was still there. Rather must we plant freedom and nurture it.

Democracy cannot function effectively unless the conception of what is its vital interest is clearly defined. Many nations today say they will defend their vital interest. But what is their vital interest? Is it territory; wealth; power to dominate others? I suggest that the vital interest of democracy is peace, the progressive development of the world and a supreme effort to provide an equal opportunity for all races. This can only be attained by the exercise of reason, ready adjustment and international democratic action in all possible fields and the full acceptance of the principles of international law and justice.

What then is our task? We must carry our weapon ready to fight for the maintenance of our liberty and the rights of man, but be ready to sheathe it at the moment the enemies of democracy have laid down their arms and their people have demonstrated that they prefer to share the gifts and participate in the wealth of the world, without war. We have demonstrated our way is best. The challenge to liberty must be accepted but, just as we have built our defenses against attack, we must recognize that is not enough. For whilst we have to develop a culture of our own, our own

FORWARD, DEMOCRACY!

characteristics, art and science, we must also teach the acceptance of Democracy itself and its responsibilities to mankind.

I have no doubt that this broad conception of democratic responsibility will bring one into conflict with the idea of national sovereignty. National sovereignty has served a great purpose in the organization of the world, acting as it has from a multiplicity of motives, but it must be accepted that the next stage in human development must be directed toward world order. Anything which stands in the way of achieving the consummation of that desirable end to which humanity is striving must be subordinated to the greater purpose.

To help in this great purpose science has been successful in providing aids to mankind and the struggles now going on between the nations do not arise from scarcity but from abundance. Democracy has tremendous aids which in no previous era did it enjoy. It has boundless wealth available for distribution socially, it has harnessed all the forces of nature to serve its purpose, and has laid upon the democratic table gifts enjoyed by no previous age. Unfortunately instead of distributing our products we turn them into gold and bury them.

Tremendous power rests in the hands of the Democracies to resist all encroachment upon liberty, and to maintain freedom. Within their boundaries reside the majority of the population of the world; they possess unlimited wealth; raw materials and power. What is needed is a resolute will to co-ordinate all these powers to resist aggression and, at the same time, to work out in common economic plans

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

whereby humanity the world over can achieve greater security and happiness by practising the arts of peace than can ever be won by war.

Cannot we then with a human mind so powerful organize a system of distribution which will obliterate poverty? My plea is: use all the power that you have as molders of the character of men and women to teach that they cannot judge life by contrast alone, that people are not wealthy because others are poor, that human development and progress must be judged by the standards of humanity as a whole.

Finally, in summarizing my points, I would suggest:

1. That we accept democracy as our guiding article of faith.
2. That we seek at all costs to maintain it, be ever ready to defend it both within and without, and develop a great comradeship with the democracies and those who are striving for liberty throughout the world.
3. That we use the opportunities it provides to adapt our social system to secure social justice and opportunity for everyone.
4. That we use the whole of our democratic strength to contribute to progress and the establishment of a world order.
5. That we strive not to make giants, but to elevate the human race.

In that spirit I say—*Forward, Democracy!*

12

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

I HAVE observed from the press that war aims are being examined. It is quite apparent that in addition to the Government, the Vested Interests, which have always had the ear of the inner section of the British Cabinet, are extremely busy at the present moment exerting all their influence to advance their respective claims to ensure that on the termination of this war their particular interests are served.

It is good that associated with this war there is a great realization that it would not pay any politician to indulge in specious promises, as occurred in the last war. People all over the world were so bitterly disillusioned.

On the other hand it behooves every citizen to give careful consideration to the world, particularly European, order which we are going to evolve when this struggle is over. It is clear, so far as the people of this country are concerned, that the fight is against Hitlerism and aggression, broken agreements and repression. In their hearts they want to see established a rule of law which will rest upon the will of the peoples of the different countries, and which will be

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

honorably observed. Security not only for themselves but for future generations.

To fight for these principles alone is not sufficient. Every proposal which emerges must be put to the test to see whether or not it will contribute to the end we have in view. It is not enough merely to talk about collective security unless, in fact, that security applies equally to all the peoples of the world.

In the period from 1919, which has been no more than a continued armistice, we have had an absolute spate of power politics. It commenced immediately the Peace Treaty was signed. Directly the Great War was over lesser hostilities ensued: The Greeks attacked the Turks; the Russians attacked the Poles, the Poles won and in the subsequent peace created fresh difficulties for themselves, the effects of which are now seen; the Baltic States were attacked; Lithuania suffered from a sense of grievance; Czecho-slovakia attacked Poland when she was the prey of Russia and Poland retaliated. Italy has taken Abyssinia and Albania, whilst Germany has sought to destroy all semblance of democracy, marching into Austria, ruthlessly attacking Czecho-slovakia and Poland, and knowing no sanctity of treaties or the true meaning of honor. What should all this teach us? That you cannot reconcile either race or sovereign nations with economic commonsense. The result of all this interplay has been to throw the world into war again to prevent the domination of Europe by one power. The peoples of the peace loving nations are against such domination whether it is brought about by aggression or any other method.

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

At a Labor Party Conference I ventured to put forward the idea that the Party and other interested people should study the possibility of a European Commonwealth of Nations, in which racial culture and even the elements of nationalism, if desired, could be preserved, but bound together by an economic unity which could act as a control against an aggressor nation. No race dominating another, eliminating the necessity for territorial expansion, eliminating the need for armaments, and assuring on terms of equality participation in the bounteous wealth of the world, with security for this and future generations.

This would involve Britain becoming as it were European and as such taking its place in the Commonwealth. It is gratifying to find that there is now a much wider-spread acceptance of this conception than there was at that time. I trust it will not become merely a matter of propaganda but that the details and possibilities of such an economic basis for Europe will be worked out.

It is not my purpose at the moment, however, to develop in detail the idea of the Commonwealth, but to direct special attention to one good feature of the Versailles Treaty —the International Labor Office. In all the speeches connected with the war I have not heard any reference to the importance and possibilities of this Office. Its position, however, is unassailable. In any war settlement there should be woven, in an irrevocable manner, in the Treaties the right of the workpeople to free association. In other words trade unions and co-operative societies should have a proper and recognized place in any state, and any destruction of such institutions should be regarded by the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

parties to such treaties to be as much a violation as the taking of territory or any other form of aggression.

In bringing about World Order it is essential to prevent as far as possible the intensification of racial differences. Trade Unionism offers to the world one of the greatest possible unifying forces producing, if given full scope, a homogeneity that nothing else can. Trade Unionism has an economic basis open to all people whatever may be their religion, race, color, or calling. Essentially it is free, being neither an instrument of policy or under orders from a particular state. Its members can join in free association with fellow trade unionists in all other states. In its discussions decisions are arrived at on the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number; the rule of majority is accepted without question, and in its international obligations it adheres to the fundamental principles of democracy. For nearly a century it has been striving to attain this end, at the close of hostilities in 1918 it lost no time in re-creating association with its fellow trade unionists in Germany, Austria and other countries involved in war against the Allies. But it has been handicapped, just as trade, exchange and everything else has been handicapped, by the difficulties which have been created by the establishment of such a large number of sovereign states, which has prevented economic union. Greater results could have been achieved but I am firmly convinced that its historical influence in middle Europe is such that there must be millions of people who have been associated with our Movement and who are longing for the creation of conditions which will

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

again give the working classes an opportunity to co-operate in a common endeavor, not for racial domination but for raising the standard of life common to us all.

It is striking that with the development of nationalism one of the first institutions to be destroyed was the Trade Union Movement. If we are now striving to destroy dictatorships, whose one great weapon is the prevention of the coming together of the workpeople to discuss in common counsel their problems, then it becomes ever more important that this great protective influence should be recognized and developed to its strongest possible point both in war aims and any settlement effected.

It is well to remember that the International Labor Office was created out of the minds of trade unionists. In their discussions with capitalist interests they have always been faced with the problem of the competitive factors arising from the lower standards of life in certain countries. It is to the credit of that veteran George Barnes, who saw the opportunity of creating an institution which would allow the workpeople of the world at least to meet together regularly to discuss their common problems, that the International Labor Office came into being. It is also striking, notwithstanding the vicissitudes through which the League has passed, that this institution, upon which to a great extent rest the hopes of the working people, has survived. True, it has suffered terrible handicaps from employers and governments, including our own, who have been blinded to their own interests and have paid greater regard to their own individual position rather than using this institution as providing an opportunity to make a contribu-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

tion to greater understanding amongst the common people. This valuable institution must not only be maintained but strengthened. I have over and over again represented the tragedy that the Foreign Office of this country had no Labor Department, or at least that the liaison with the Ministry of Labor was so limited.

Those who have been to Geneva have seen the unfortunate impression which has been created in the minds of representatives from other countries that Britain was against them. The Foreign Office, the League and the Secretariat and other superior persons have looked upon this institution and the Labor Assemblies as a sort of "poor Brother" who was always with them. Such an attitude of mind must be abolished. The future government of the world will pass more and more into the hands of ordinary folk. Recent events have demonstrated the suffering people may go through, as in the case of Poland, when its Government does not carry with it the whole-hearted unified support of the people it represents. What is it that creates this unifying force in Labor? They are not discussing strategy, territory, ambitions and the glorification of their Nation. They meet to discuss problems affecting their work, leisure, security—real security. For instance, the miners of Britain, Poland and Germany are miners, the problems they face are of a similar character—the risks to life due to the dangerous nature of their work; the inadequate reward they get for the services they render. These difficulties are common to them all. They know they are being played off one against the other by the industrial and financial interests, irrespective of country. They are conscious that if the

THE RIGHTS OF MAN

standard of living can be raised in a backward country it not only benefits that country but is also a contribution to their own security. That applies similarly to transport workers or any other trade. If they meet to discuss social services, better educational facilities, it is all a contribution to a higher civilization, and that is the real driving force.

If the Governments decide to arrive at peace terms on sovereign states alone, disregarding these great economic and social factors, peace and security cannot be maintained for:

The military regard settlement in terms of strategy alone, boundaries and focal points.

Finance approaches the problem from the point of view of exchanges, again producing a situation which leads to conflict.

Industry weighs the position in terms of competition and markets.

Labor, on the other hand, has no ax to grind and approaches these problems co-operatively with a view to the common good of mankind.

If the first three forces are again predominant in the settlement of this great conflict, it will be a tragedy, and will have again to be fought out at no distant date.

If, however, the barriers between the peoples of the World can be broken down, allowing them to associate freely, a great contribution toward permanent peace can be made.

I have had experience of the great heart of Labor and the assistance which has been freely given by its peoples to

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

each other in economic and other struggles. In the past the German trade unionists have contributed freely to us when we have been in difficulty, so have the trade unionists in other countries, and we in turn have given equal response. Not once do I remember conflict. When serious difficulties have arisen amongst our ranks, notwithstanding the attacks of our own press or the press of other countries against us, there has always been demonstrated that common underlying feeling of brotherhood between the working people.

I plead therefore that it shall feature to a much greater extent in a solution of these great issues than has hitherto been permitted. I am certain that those who have handled foreign affairs in the past have never felt it, have never been conscious of its existence or realized that here was a great force for peace that must be harnessed for the good of humanity.

PART TWO

EDITORIAL NOTE

THESE earlier speeches and writings appeared during the years when Mr. Bevin was famous as the great Trade Union Leader, the General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union. They indicate his point of view on various questions of the hour: social reform, relationships within the Commonwealth, health in industry, etc. Many of the points raised by him in these speeches influenced subsequent legislation. For instance, Mr. Bevin, who had served for some years on the Colonial Development Board, in his presidential speech to the Trades Union Congress in 1937 suggested that more attention should be given to labor and social conditions in the Colonial Empire. The speech led directly to the creation of a Colonial Labor Advisory Committee to the Trades Union Congress and contributed to the public concern which resulted in the appointment of the Royal Commission to the West Indies and other inquiries into colonial economic and social problems. It stimulated the establishment in the Colonies of labor departments and the enactment of industrial and social legislation and molded

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

opinion which later found expression in the policy of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1940. The Act marks a turning point in Colonial administration.

Likewise some of the social reforms he asks for in "The Britain I Want to See" had been undertaken or were underway when the war broke out and some of the suggestions made in the speech on Industrial Health have been put into practice by Mr. Bevin himself as Minister of Labor.

When the war broke out, the unions of Great Britain offered their wholehearted co-operation in war production: though the Labor Party did not feel able to enter the Government under Mr. Chamberlain's leadership. Mr. Bevin reviews the help given by the unions during the first eight months of the war and assesses the situation as it was in April 1940. A month after his speech was made, however, Mr. Chamberlain resigned and the Labor Party declared its willingness to enter a government led by Mr. Winston Churchill. Mr. Bevin was offered and accepted the Ministry of Labor and National Service and undertook immediately the reorganization of labor for an increased war production. This story is told in the first part of this book.

13

THE BRITAIN I WANT TO SEE

IT IS necessary, in order to make reasonable assumptions as to the course the nation is traveling, to have a fairly clear idea of the road we have been pursuing since the great upheaval of 1914–18, and to have in one's mind the road one would like the nation to pursue in the future.

It has been said that “the seeds of every great war are sown in the settlements of the previous war,” and the road selected by this nation, in common with others at the close of the Great War, is largely responsible for the present chaotic state and the rise of economic nationalism.

The outlook of the British people at the end of the last war may be described as war-weary, nerve-strung, yet hopeful that, having spent all this blood and treasure, the leaders of the great nations would bend their energies in the direction of preventing such a catastrophe ever occurring again.

Perhaps the greatest handicap from which we suffered was the fact that a large proportion of the best brains of the country had been destroyed, and so the war-soaked

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

minds, hampered by pre-war concepts and war hatreds, did not settle Peace, but drew up a Treaty.

They did not visualize a new world where equality between the peoples and an adequate opportunity to develop was the essential aim to strive for.

From the day in 1918 when I listened to Mr. Lloyd George at Bristol, I have been under no delusion as to the reaction of the policy he then advocated upon our financial and domestic life. I happened to be a parliamentary candidate at that time, and was asked if I would support the policy of making Germany pay. I declined, despite all the feeling of antagonism such refusal created against me.

As a democrat seeking the suffrage of democracy I conceived it my duty, irrespective of whether I won or lost, to tell the people the truth and to declare that if they followed the road then suggested they would find the country saddled with millions of unemployed and faced with starvation within a very few years.

My opponents knew this better than I: they knew the exchange system of the world and the basis of international trade; they had held high office; but they traded on the nerve-strung feelings and hopes of the moment, placing a parliamentary majority before the righteous duty of stating the truth.

What was the road the nation decided to take? Reparations, war debts and a punitive policy on the defeated; the creation of top-heavy states like Austria, which has contributed so much to the instability of Europe and has led us to tariffs, restrictions of international exchange, economic nationalism, the semiruination of our great Mercantile

THE BRITAIN I WANT TO SEE

Marine and the worst vices of speculation and usury.

It produced a perfect Eldorado to the most sordid and criminal speculators the world has ever seen, the type of citizen who has no regard for the people, the nation, or honor, and who cares not whom he ruins or the effect of his acts on national or international life. Many of them have borne great names; they have been regarded as leaders in the financial and social world; they have influenced and dominated governments.

And it has led to a currency war in which the currency, which should be used internationally as a means of settlement of international balances, has become an adjunct of foreign policy and a weapon in an international economic struggle. It has created an erroneous idea in the minds of people in many countries that only by keeping other nations down can one be successful.

The position, as I see it, is that all the countries of the world are trying to get off this ruinous road. The difficulty is: they cannot turn back and, at the moment, in their bewilderment, they seem to be trying to avoid the inevitable end—war.

In this confused struggle Middle Europe has adopted Fascism; Fascism, if persisted in, will lead to war and disaster, for it does not offer any solution to the economic problems of the people. Starvation and unemployment increase under it. Its principal weapons are tyranny, corruption, depression of the standard of life, regimentation of the people, destruction of freedom and an attempt to stabilize the classes. Such a policy must inevitably lead to atrophy.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

What road is Britain trying to take? Amid all the chaos and difficulty, our leaders—the Foreign Ministers particularly—appear to be walking a tightrope. The reasons for this are: we represent a great Empire which controls enormous quantities of raw materials, we have large foreign investments, we are a financial nation, and we are dependent upon world trade, yet at the same time we are attempting to develop enforced nationalism at home. It is trying to reconcile the irreconcilable.

The measures now being taken are being influenced by two conditions: (1) to find means to substitute the gold standard, which is no longer effective to regulate exchanges; (2) to adopt all kinds of marketing and other measures with a view to trying to evade the real solution, which is the social ownership of the important national industries.

Can the nation, therefore, with democratic institutions, successfully emerge from this chaos? I am convinced that if democracy is given the facts upon which to base its judgment without panic, not only shall we find solutions, but we shall lead the world back to free institutions.

Therefore, one of the most important things at the moment must be a grim determination to preserve democratic institutions, whether national, municipal or voluntary, for these institutions give stability and provide machinery through which the State can work, which is of tremendous value.

It is the only means that exists which allows reasoned thought and opportunity to develop into its rightful heritage, and when it does make changes, makes them by consent, thereby establishing them upon a firm foundation.

THE BRITAIN I WANT TO SEE

I have no confidence in the superman; the limitations of supposedly great men are obvious. I have spent my life among ordinary working people; I am one of them. I have seen them faced with the most difficult problems; place the truth before them—the facts, whether they are good or bad—and they display an understanding, ability and courage that confound the wisdom of the so-called great.

Then I consider that the national leaders should frankly state the aims and objects of their foreign policy to our own people. Why are statesmen afraid to tell us? There is no need for secrecy; the people do not want war. The people accept the view that there is room on this planet for us all.

The nation is also entitled to a frank statement on the currency problem; for the power to land us into international difficulties and obligations in the name of Britain is wielded secretly behind the scenes. The nation should insist that anything done in her name and with her money power with other peoples should be made public. We must end the reign of the “King Johns” of finance, remove this autocracy and bring finance under proper public control. There is no mystery about this money problem to those who know. It is made a mystery deliberately.

For psychological and practical reasons I would invite the nation to give a lead to the world; to cut clear of the controversy of sterling, the dollar, the franc and the yen; and to divide the currencies of the world into two separate categories—the one, international, and the other for internal use.

The international should be a world currency and be

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

used for the purpose of settling all international obligations. We have the instrument to create it in the Bank of International Settlements.

The internal currency should be a national currency. It should be used for the exchange of internal goods, and be managed in such a way as to allow the country to develop to the full, and purchasing capacity to be increased as productive capacity increases.

The next consideration is one of raw materials. I am convinced that the attempt to monopolize raw materials and their development by the concession method is one of the greatest causes of conflict between nations.

A bold effort should be made to secure a Convention, signed by the nations, agreeing to bring basic raw materials under national ownership in each State, and the establishment of an international body to regulate the exploitation of such raw materials, with an agreement that any nation desiring industrial development shall have access to the available sources of raw materials on due payment. Also, that output shall be so organized as to meet the legitimate world requirements and maintain a stable price level.

Then there is the question of production and consumption. In addition to taking all possible steps at home, I would like to see Britain give a bold lead, through the International Labor Office, for the raising of the standard of living throughout the world.

Our national leaders, representing different governments, who have been our spokesmen at Geneva, have been confused and ambiguous; they have displayed a lack of

THE BRITAIN I WANT TO SEE

appreciation of the great services to humanity of which this Department is capable.

The wages of labor are a big factor in production. The raising of the standard of living internationally would make a tremendous contribution toward getting us out of the world morass.

We are now in negotiation with Japan and India in connection with the cotton trade; yet if the purchasing power of the masses of India was increased by twopence per head per week the problem of the Indian market would almost vanish. The spindles of Lancashire would be working full time.

We, like other industrial nations, seem to be looking for some mystical market for our goods. The only market that really exists is the masses who produce goods. The accumulation of wealth by individuals does not increase consumption.

Therefore, can you visualize the International Labor Conference, not merely debating, but deciding ways and means to enable the people to consume the goods they have produced? This, together with an international currency and the organization, development and use of basic raw material, would tend to maintain equilibrium throughout the world.

I now turn to home. Your attitude to problems abroad must be influenced by your attitude to internal problems. Disraeli once said, "There are two nations, that of the rich, and that of the poor."

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

There is a tendency now to create three nations—the upper classes, the working classes who are actually in work, and the submerged class that is now being definitely sentenced to live on either the Ministry of Health scale, which is 4s. 8d. (about \$1.15) per week, per man, or the British Medical Association scale of 5s. 10½d. (about \$1.45) per man, whichever may be accepted—both of which are terribly bad, and neither of which would be acceptable to the professional classes by whom they have been drawn up.

On the other hand, you have the reorganization of industry, trustification, monopoly, with financial domination, all denying and limiting opportunities, and a general attempt to crystallize these into permanency.

In the framing of a domestic policy, we should be influenced by the principles of equality. I recognize there is bound to be diversification in talents and ability, but the scientist who has contributed to civilization and the worker who has produced the goods are, in my opinion, entitled to a greater position of honor than the financier who exploits the brains, ability and production of others, and I want this equality expressed in every piece of legislation throughout our national life.

We are being congratulated on a balanced Budget, and the possibility of a surplus, but if we approach the question of balance correctly we must not do so in terms of money only, but in terms of life, health and opportunity.

I do not feel any enthusiasm when I am told there is a surplus, when I have to set against it such figures as appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* on January 19, 1940—that the number of recruits who failed to reach the Army

THE BRITAIN I WANT TO SEE

Standard in the case of line regiments for the whole country was 52 per cent, and, in the industrial north—where the cut in unemployment benefit and social services generally has had most devastating effect—the percentage of failures is 68.

One has to set against the balance of money the cost that will have to be borne as the result of such suffering, such as insanity, crime, cost of prisons, curative efforts, and so forth. This surplus, if used aright, should have been used for the prevention of starvation and provision of work.

The Archbishop of Canterbury called our attention to the terrible mortgage handed on to us from the nineteenth century in connection with slums. What a terrible physical and moral mortgage the country is now handing on as the price of a balanced money budget and surplus! This is primarily due to an unfortunate middle-class attitude of mind, which is reflected by those in power.

It may have been necessary recently, under the present chaotic conditions, to vote more than a billion and a half dollars for an Equalization Fund. It was done without the turning of a hair.

It may be lost—no one knows; but it is difficult to understand the leaders of the nation who can do that and, at the same time and in the same Parliament, when their attention is called to children starving, the plight of distressed areas, the undermining of the health of the people, continued unemployment, the destruction of the most valuable asset of the nation—the craft and skill of our people—state that the nation cannot afford to grant the necessary money for the provision of work and the proper sustenance of the peo-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

ple. I repeat, it is purely due to a conception and cannot be justified by fact.

I want a Britain that places humanity first. Look at the problem of our great municipalities which are left with derelict communities. They must be freed from the restrictions now imposed. They must be given an opportunity to save themselves, to develop industry and the land around, and opportunities for their people.

They must not be handicapped by the restrictions which are really imposed by private and moneyed interests; they must not have to pay ransom to the usurer as a price of developing opportunities for their people. For to satisfy the demands of the usurer in our national life takes from us the largest percentage of our taxation. That is what we cannot afford.

When we approach the problem of education, from the point of view of equality of opportunity and a right of the children of the masses to the best possible chances that life can give, what do we find?

We find that as a nation we have contributed a rebate—by the relief of taxation—to the income-tax-paying classes, to enable them to keep their children at school. The school-leaving age of the working-class children should be raised, and if the wage of the parents is not of a standard to enable them adequately to feed, clothe and house them, then they are entitled to be supported by the State.

There is no difference in principle between granting relief of taxation to the income-tax payer, to assist him in keeping his children at school, and giving a measure of support to those whose income does not reach the income-tax-paying standard.

THE BRITAIN I WANT TO SEE

You cannot now find full employment for all these children, and many of those who are employed are taken into industry at the age of fourteen and discharged at eighteen and their lives are wasted and ruined. On the grounds of equality and justice the nation should face up to this problem immediately.

Similarly with pensions. The nation has measured its liability to a skilled craftsman, a miner, and to industrial workers generally at ten shillings per week, for which they contribute. This pension is totally inadequate.

The nation has provided pensions for judges, civil servants, policemen, teachers, municipal servants and the professional classes. I make no complaint about this; but, on the grounds of equality and justice, similar provision should be made for the miners, the dockers, the agricultural workers, textile workers, the great engineering trades and all the others who, after all, run the biggest risk of unemployment during their working life; who are the real victims of industrial depression and feel every blast of international events. They have the greatest struggle, inadequate pay, no security; yet their skill is the real source of the nation's wealth.

Again, with the development of machinery and rationalization, should it be left only to the Trade Unionists, who always struggle and fight on behalf of the workers, generally to adjust hours of labor, and so forth?

When industry is being reorganized and great changes are effected, the whole problem of the workers' position should be taken into consideration and dealt with adequately, and adjustments made in the hours of labor.

Plans for removal and housing and amenities under the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

new conditions should be dealt with in a proper, orderly and rational way, and the workers should not be left, as at the present time, as social derelicts, with their source of livelihood gone and without hope.

I want to see a Britain that is constantly considering the development of its own national resources. Why should our land be flooded when we have idle labor? Why should thousands of our villages and many towns be without an adequate water supply?

Why should we go to the ends of the earth for the power to drive our industry by oil when we could develop a great national gas grid?

Why should we have slums or unfit housing when we possess the best clay, the best slates, tiles and labor, and all the essentials to house our people properly?

Why should we have filthy trains to ride in, unhealthful, spreading disease, when we could have a good national transport service?

We boast of how we have colonized other countries and developed them. Surely a nation alive to the requirements and aspirations that education and other developments have created in the hearts and minds of the people, should be able to tackle with vigor the problems at home.

I want to see Britain get off the present road and carve out a new way on the lines I have indicated, which may be summarized as follows:

A clear and bold lead for world peace.

A definite lead to the world to establish an international currency.

THE BRITAIN I WANT TO SEE

A willingness not only to seek equality abroad but to be ready to give it.

A bold lead to curb the concession hunters, who are the source of so much mischief, and to bring under public ownership and control, through an international organization, the essential raw material resources of the world, making them available for human needs and development. A bold step to curb the power and influence of high finance and to relegate speculation to the limbo of the past.

I want to see Great Britain join with every nation that it can, and particularly throughout the Empire, to raise the standard of living not only of the white race, but of the great masses of colored races throughout the world.

I want to see the nation strive to shorten the hours of labor, to give full facilities for education, to pension the aged, to balance leisure and toil and afford an opportunity for the development of a wider culture in the arts and crafts, and for the development of travel and knowledge.

I know that all this involves the bringing in of great measures of social ownership and the freeing of land, mines and capital from the control of a favored few.

The survival of the fittest of the future will resolve itself, not in the nation which can wield best the glittering sword or boast of its most effective poison gas; it will be in the nation which is successful in grappling with the terrible problem of poverty and disease and can boast of a healthy, virile people, economically and politically equal.

14

THE COMMONWEALTH

1. *The Trade Union Congress* * (1937)

DEVELOPMENTS in the British Commonwealth of Nations have been most encouraging from the Labor standpoint.

I am sure you will all join with me in congratulating the New Zealand Labor Party and Movement on their wonderful success in winning power in that Dominion, and expressing our delight at the example they have shown in the introduction of remedial legislation.

* NOTE ON TRADE UNION MOVEMENT IN THE BRITISH COLONIAL DEPENDENCIES

In 1930 the attention of Colonial Governments was drawn by the then Secretary of State to the desirability of giving sympathetic supervision and guidance to organizations of laborers which were likely to develop and which would have no experience of combination. He suggested that where it did not already exist, simple Trade Union legislation should be enacted declaring that trade unions were not criminal or unlawful for civil purposes, and also providing for their compulsory registration. A considerable volume of legislation was subsequently passed and at the present time some twenty-eight territories have Trade Union or Trade Union Disputes legislation on their Statute Books. The Trade Union legislation is in nearly every instance based upon that of the United Kingdom, but it naturally varies very much according to local conditions. In some territories no trade unions have been formed, or are likely to be formed for a considerable time; in

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

We are also looking forward with very great interest to the Australian election. Labor's return to power in that Commonwealth will mean, we are confident, new developments in Trade Union influence on legislation in which there have already been some remarkable experiments in Australia.

The British Trade Union Congress has from time to time rendered considerable assistance to our Indian comrades. A new political constitution has now been inaugurated. What will be the fate of the scores of millions of workers

others, the movement has made substantial and rapid progress. It is likely that further Trade Union legislation will be passed in the near future in many territories, owing to the requirements of Section 1 (2)(a) of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, 1940.

Four years ago, practically no trade unions had been registered under the various Colonial Ordinances. To-day, the number is in the neighborhood of 200, the large majority being in Cyprus, Ceylon, Jamaica, British Guiana, Trinidad, Mauritius and Nigeria. Several unions have also been formed in Sierra Leone, and a few even in East Africa, including two Indian unions in Kenya. Practically all these unions are at present very small, being unions of persons in specific trades, with a membership of 100 or so persons. In British Guiana and Jamaica, however, unions of a general character have also been formed, with a membership of well over 10,000 persons. It is likely that unions will be formed and registered in the near future in the Gold Coast and in Malaya, where Trade Union legislation was enacted last year.

The guidance of this young movement along constitutional lines has presented a problem of some difficulty to many Colonial Governments, since the leaders of the new trade unions are nearly always inexperienced and very often politically-minded and seek to retain their position and influence by the advocacy of spectacular action. There is, however, no doubt that, owing to the endeavors of the officers in the Colonial Labor Departments, the advantages to be gained by collective bargaining and the settlement of differences round the table are becoming slowly appreciated. In order to assist in the development of this spirit, consideration is being given at the present time to the appointment of experienced trade unionists from this country as Colonial Labor Officers, and it is hoped to arrange for one or two such candidates to be selected and sent out in this capacity at an early date.

THE COMMONWEALTH

under that Constitution we do not know. But we shall watch with tremendous interest the development of labor legislation. A strong Trade Union Movement there is more than ever necessary, and it will be our duty to give what help and guidance we can toward achieving this.

News is coming through that all is not well regarding labor matters in our Colonies. There are 66,000,000 people, mainly colored, ruled from the Colonial Office in Whitehall. Most of them are voteless. A great responsibility rests upon us. The disturbances which have taken place in the British West Indies are not without cause. A public survey of labor standards and conditions is absolutely imperative. I am certain that the citizens of this country do not want to be a party to the exploitation of dependent colored peoples.

This Congress could do a great work by initiating an investigation into colonial labor conditions and publishing the results so that the public could be informed.

Palestine, as a mandated territory, is one of our responsibilities. One of the great tragedies of the world has been the persecution of the Jews. With the granting of the Palestine Mandate we looked forward with hope to the ending of this persecution. Later, when we saw the remarkable response of the Jews in the building of new homes, and their co-operative effort, a development which has won the admiration of the world, our expectations ran high. Persecution of the Jews, however, broke out again, particularly under the Nazi regime in Germany. Now a new proposal has emerged to partition Palestine.

I make no pronouncement on the merits or demerits of

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

that proposal. It has been the subject of serious discussion at the Zionist Congress. The test which I think will have to be applied by the labor movement is whether it will contribute toward the ending for all time of the persecution of the Jewish race. Will the fact that they are a State with Ambassadors at the various Chancelleries of the world assist them to a greater extent than the mandate granted by the League?

British Labor in recent years has preserved close contact with the Trade Unions in Palestine. Congress, I am sure, would endorse any consultation that could be arranged between representatives of our General Council and the Palestine Trade Unions, which would assist them in the solution of their problems.

2. *The British Commonwealth Relations Conference (1938)*

The British Commonwealth Relations Conference was a very peculiar one to me, because it was the first I had ever attended at which nobody had to come to a conclusion about anything. But, running through the whole discussion and the constant repetition that took place under the various heads, we found ourselves constantly brought back to about five or six main points which can be regarded as the most prominent matters exercising the minds of all the representatives who were there. I put them in this order: the Commonwealth and external affairs, defense, constitutional problems, trade—colonial and empire—migration and social problems. These heads really represent the sub-

THE COMMONWEALTH

jects which were predominant in the minds of those attending the Conference.

Taking external affairs first, there were two lines of thought running through them. One was an inherent desire to direct the external affairs of the Commonwealth to a given objective, if that could be found possible. In doing that, however, there was the very strong reservation that there must be no difference in the responsibility of each constituent part of the Commonwealth. I felt that we were considerably handicapped in getting to grips with this problem of foreign policy owing to the loss, or lack, of confidence here at home in the conduct of foreign affairs since the war. It must be remembered that the Commonwealth countries had had their policy directed toward the League of Nations. They had become constituent parts of it, and had played a very considerable part in its development, and suddenly, after a series of events which I need not mention, the League of Nations almost broke down. But, notwithstanding the breaking down of the League of Nations, it will be agreed that the great objective in the minds of the delegates at the Conference was still to resort to some kind of collective effort in order that this Commonwealth may be directed to the re-establishment of world order in some form or other. I formed the opinion, as a result of discussions outside the Conference, both in New Zealand and Australia, that the reasons for the lack of confidence in Great Britain could be expressed briefly as follows: "We increased our National Debt. We paid the price in man power in common with the rest of the Empire, but we have in the main left the conduct of affairs to the Home

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

Government; and in the handling of the affairs of Europe arising out of the Peace Treaties generally you have landed us in a worse position than we were at the close of the war." This was running through the minds of a very large number of people both inside and outside the Conference. In the rather keen discussion as to responsibility for this matter we had what was to me a revelation, namely, that one of the big contributions to the policy of the home country in relation to the Manchurian affair was influenced by Australia herself. I do not think the people of this country had any idea of the pressure put upon the Home Government by Australia against the adoption of anything in the nature of sanctions in 1932, because of Australia's own fears. I doubt very much whether many people in Australia have any idea of the policy adopted at that time. Another very revealing fact came out, and that was in relation to Abyssinia. It was generally assumed that the aim of the Hoare-Laval business was to save the remnants of Abyssinia, but I think it was brought out very clearly that that step was really taken because of the reverses Italy had suffered, and it was done to save Italy. This was known pretty universally in the Dominions, and this kind of deceptive tactic—starting on a road and not seeing it through—has left bewilderment and lack of confidence as to where the old country is traveling in these matters. There was a generous attitude of mind among the members of the Dominion groups to any real drive to establish a sound world peace, and a willingness to make contributions to that end was indicated. But added to this problem there was the Czechoslovakian affair, which was going on at the time of our meeting, and there again, to say

THE COMMONWEALTH

the least of it, there is a tremendous lack of knowledge and understanding as to why we did what we did, and whether it was justified; and the feeling left at the present moment in my mind is one of absolute bewilderment as to where we really are traveling in this country.

I was also impressed by the psychological effect of a good many movements in this country. It was surprising to find how the propaganda and the stories relating to such institutions as the "Cliveden Set" and the Londonderry attitude in relation to Germany (I use that phrase for brevity), and the constant talk of Four-Power Pacts, and as to whether we were really striving to establish a Fascist bloc in Western Europe, were perturbing the people in the Dominions. We had no clear answer to give them. They are intensely democratic, and they are considerably perturbed both with regard to the Press and certain influences operating in high quarters in this country, and as to whether we really are serious about these liberties, or what price we are willing to pay for an alleged security by linking up with the Fascist Powers. We had to ask ourselves (at least I did) what is the best way to educate people at home and in the Dominions as to the true purposes of foreign policy, and the road we are in fact traveling, and the grounds for the changes we are making from time to time.

Personally, I came to the conclusion that the Imperial Conference, with all its secrecy, was too limited and circumscribed an arrangement to handle the affairs of a great Commonwealth of this character. In a democratic nation it is the people, after all, who must determine on the questions of war and peace; and the present method of handling

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

external affairs between the Dominions and ourselves leaves, in my view, the people in the Dominions, as indeed one must confess even here at home so far as the masses are concerned, in a state of ignorance. The League, as a League, is not operative for the moment, and I took the view (which I hold even more strongly since my return) that one of the best steps to take at the present moment would be something in the nature of a League Assembly of the British Commonwealth itself, in order that all the parties in the Commonwealth might be represented, and the facts relating to external affairs and other matters might be discussed freely and in a manner to give confidence to those who have ultimately to share the fate of the decision of governments in these matters. And while there was a certain amount of fear, as there usually is in these matters, that such an Assembly would make inroads on executive decisions, and it was argued that even the League decisions were come to behind closed doors and in various surreptitious ways, yet I thought that such an arrangement might even lead to an extension of the Commonwealth idea and provide a basis upon which to begin building up again a League of Sovereign States, something that could be made workable and restore confidence throughout the Commonwealth. This is extremely vital when one recognizes that parties in the Commonwealth are very evenly divided, and that while in this country we have only had short periods of Labor Governments, such governments will be almost a permanent feature in the Commonwealth countries at no distant date, and it is very vital that the fullest and most responsible knowledge of affairs should be generally avail-

THE COMMONWEALTH

able. One other point: we found in handling these problems of external affairs that a variety of practices were advocated. Australia, for instance, wanted the fullest system of consultation with the British Foreign Office, and exercised it to the full; but though she had full consultation, it was not felt to be quite the same thing as if the Cabinet in her own country were represented in the various parts of the world. And, on the Labor side in Australia, it has now become a cardinal point of policy that, instead of this form of second-hand information through the British Foreign Office, they should establish contact with the other nations of the world direct.

The next point is the question of defense. I think our military and naval colleagues put forward constructive ideas and proposals which ought to lead, if taken up by the Governments, to practical results. As I understood them, they recommended acceptance of responsibility by Commonwealth countries for given areas, based on territorial position, the whole to be dovetailed and linked into a general defense plan. But in this defense problem, you have to remember that in Great Britain we are bound by the Eden declaration of April, 1937, in which the British people, without question, without being able to say anything, must, if that pledge is put into effect, go to war to defend any part of the British Empire and the countries with whom we have treaties. On the other hand, a very striking thing is that the Dominions—and I do not think they quite appreciate the point—have no reciprocal obliga-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

tion, if their interpretation of their rights under the Statute of Westminster is correct. And I feel quite sure that, if the British people were conscious of the fact that they are under an obligation to go to war to defend any part of the British Empire, whatever the nature of the quarrel, and, at the same time, that Canada, or any other part of the British Commonwealth, can at the last moment through her Parliament declare her neutrality, they would not be a party to such a binding undertaking. I am sure that fact is not consciously realized by the people of this country. There appear to be great divergencies in opinion on this question. We had a large number of professors with us, and there was a tendency to belittle them, but I am impressed by the fact that, so far as Canada is concerned, it is out of the universities that the new Civil Service will come; it is out of the universities to a very large extent that those who make policy in Canada will be found; and, if the theories and the attitude to the defense problem and the constitutional problem, to which I will refer in a moment, gain ground—and they are gaining ground throughout the British Commonwealth—then the quicker the whole matter of defense is placed on a sound and agreed basis, the better it will be for the Commonwealth as a whole.

Therefore, the theory that there is such a thing, as the Irishman put it, as a divisible Crown seems to me to be perfectly farcical, and would not hold good in a crisis of that character. It may result in secession at a critical moment, or it may result in disruption, but, what is worse in my view, it may lead to the building up of a strategical policy by the Imperial defense authorities which may break

THE COMMONWEALTH

down at a critical moment unless an understanding is arrived at between the constituent parts of the Commonwealth. In the light of the discussions at the Conference, these great divergencies which exist ought not to be left to be settled or dealt with at the moment of crisis. It is better, even if we have to sacrifice the principle of sovereignty as it is now understood, to put this defense and constitutional business on a sound understandable footing, not only that we may understand it in this country, but so that the citizens of the other countries may have to face their own responsibilities in their own countries. Such a change would be better for all of us.

Canada does not desire to be consulted on foreign affairs, and this illustrates my point, if one is to take the view of the Canadian representatives. They say: "We do not want this close consultation, because by the very act of consultation we may be assumed to be entering into commitments." And that I suggest, for the sake of both parties, is a very unsatisfactory state.

In Australia, as far as I could see, there were two lines of thought. The leaders of the labor movement are willing to shoulder enormous responsibilities for the defense of Australia. They are also willing, so far as I can understand their attitude—and I discussed it very closely with them—to go into this problem of defense so as to arrive at an understandable basis as to the contribution they should make, providing the decision is taken openly and with the full knowledge of the citizens of Australia. The other Party seems to go on the lines I have already described, of being content with consultation and waiting to determine

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

its policy when the crisis arises: and therefore it makes it all the more important, if I may refer back to the point I made just now, to have some form of League Assembly in which the Home Government and the British people, as well as the Dominion people, can arrive at a common understanding in the interest of all the parties concerned.

Now, this affects seriously the question of finance. It is very doubtful whether the citizens of New Zealand and Australia, who have really to face great problems in the Pacific, have any idea of the contribution which has to be made by the British people toward their security, and it has never been examined, so far as I know, in a practical and scientific way. The question of liberty of action was particularly emphasized so far as South Africa was concerned, and yet South Africa may represent the very center of the problems that are looming ahead; and therefore I say that if a part of the British Commonwealth will not accept what are, in my view, obligations, neither do I think the British people should, willy-nilly, be called upon to give effect to the whole of the Eden declaration.

The constitutional question also gave ground for a good deal of discussion. It seemed to crop up in relation to everything else. One thing seemed to be very encouraging. We have satisfied all the constitutional lawyers and professors in Ireland; we do not seem to have satisfied them anywhere else. In fact, Ireland tells us now that we are such good people that they will do anything for us. Only one handicap remains, viz., the boundary question. But the impression left on my mind is this: that what I may describe as the Balfourian dexterity which seems to be typified in

THE COMMONWEALTH

the Statute of Westminster has outgrown itself, short as the period is since that Act was carried. I am convinced that you will have to give the Dominions complete control over their own constitutions without interference from Westminister, and allow them to modify those constitutions in whatever way they deem necessary; and, as I have already said, you have to get rid of this fiction of the divisibility of the Crown. And here again I believe that if this problem is frankly faced at an Assembly of the Commonwealth, properly constituted, probably many of the difficulties and misunderstandings and suspicions that arise while nations are growing to full stature would disappear; and there would be less discussion of the constitutional points, and less worry about them, if once the matter were ventilated with all the parties present and full responsibility under the other heads were acknowledged. I recognize that trade, to which I will refer in a moment, and many other great problems would have to be solved at the same time, but when people become keen on these constitutional points, then it becomes obvious that it would be better to settle them as quickly as we can. It would certainly make the next British Commonwealth Relations Conference much more effective if the constitutional point were removed.

Bound up with that point, however, and with external affairs and others, is the question of trade; and in the consideration of trade the problem of the Ottawa Agreements and Imperial Preferences obviously figured most largely. I believe there was a consensus of opinion that the Ottawa system in its present form could not be maintained. It was introduced, so it was stated, to try to counteract the effects

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

of deflation; but if the Dominions rise to absolute constitutional liberty, as they claim the right to do, they cannot have their cake and eat it. I do not believe that they themselves can carry on negotiations for trade agreements with other countries and operate the Most-Favored-Nation Clause honestly and maintain the Preference system. It is bound to create difficulties, and indeed I think, judging by the new treaty with the United States, that it is pretty obvious that it has been one of the great difficulties in the negotiations, and it has had to be modified to some extent. But our minds turned rather in another direction. We asked ourselves whether the Ottawa Agreement could be used to accomplish a wider purpose. We, for good or ill, have started on the Ottawa system. When an economy over such a wide area of the world between the primary producers and the manufacturing industries has been built up, it is a very difficult thing to change it and to break it. On the other hand, the countries of the world are faced with the problem of freeing trade and using their economic position to make a contribution to world appeasement, and a very interesting discussion took place, and I submit it to you that probably the best thing to do would be to broaden the Ottawa system and invite other nations to join in it. In other words, those nations that are prepared to use the Ottawa system to come in on a lower tariff policy should be permitted to do so.

In addition, there was a divergence of views on a point which I am not really going to put now, but on which, on reflection, and in view of subsequent world events, I feel more strongly now than I did then: that the privilege of coming in and sharing in the newer system of exchange

THE COMMONWEALTH

and the freer methods of the Ottawa system, which would result in the giving up of the Preferences to ourselves, should be reserved to nations who are willing to set aside the method of aggression, and so use the Ottawa system as an economic attraction over a wide area of the world to those States who feel willing to operate on a peaceful basis. I believe that if it is carefully examined—though it was not intended for that purpose when it was devised—the Ottawa Preference system does represent an opportunity to offer appeasement to a very wide area of the world and to make it economically worth while. I found, when discussing this with friends of mine from Central Europe, before I went to Australia, that they said to me: “If you keep offering us military pacts, military arrangements, it makes no appeal to the Have-Nots throughout the world; you should offer some economic solution.” I think I can say that, while no conclusion was arrived at at the Conference, this idea made an appeal to many there as probably a road along which we in the British Empire—possibly in common with the great colonial Powers, even though small countries like Belgium and Holland—might be able, as it were, to open up on a new basis if the Ottawa system could be used for a purpose for which it was not intended in the beginning, but which is vitally necessary now—collective economic rights and collective defense. I think, however, that the citizens of the Commonwealth would all want an assurance that, if these markets were opened up and this new situation was created, it would not be used for aggression, but rather for raising the standard of life of the people throughout the world.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

May I now make a reference, though it was not discussed very much, to the question of the colonial Empire in its relation to the Commonwealth? There appears to be a general view that it was rather a mistake to bring the colonial Empire within the Ottawa system. We have departed from the traditional policy of trusteeship. We gave the impression to the world that we were creating a monopoly, and caused a demand to arise for the transfer of territory in a keener form and over a wider area than might otherwise have arisen. Here again I believe that if the Commonwealth as a whole, together with other colonial Powers, could utilize the colonial territory to offer an entry for trade and development to non-aggressors, it would be a good thing; because when the colonial problem was examined in the Conference, I think all my colleagues will agree, it was not the economic position that agitated peoples' minds so much. For example, in the minds of the members of the Conference from Africa the question was: Will there be an air base in Tanganyika if we return it? What will be our position in South-West Africa if concessions are made? Wherever you examined the colonial position, there you found the problem of war and strategy immediately arising, and you were handicapped in dealing with the problem from the point of view of, shall I say, human necessity and human development, because of the awful fear that existed behind the minds of those closely concerned. If fear, then, is the great handicap to dealing with this problem—and I think that is a correct description—if we wish to develop the world by economic means instead of by fighting, then would it not be wise to make it one cardinal point that, in

THE COMMONWEALTH

any colonial discussion, it should be stated that those parts of the world at least should be disarmed, so that you remove one great cause of fear in your approach to the problem? The second point in regard to colonial territories which I think is very vital and which impressed itself on my mind, was the imperative need to look upon colonial territories from the point of view of development, and not merely from the point of view of strategy and raw materials. Great criticism came from the South Africans in relation to Bechuanaland and Basutoland. They allege that Great Britain has probably very good reasons why we will not give them to the Union; but while we will not give them to the Union, we will not develop them ourselves, and we are not utilizing them either for the benefit of the natives or for ourselves. That was a charge I think which the British group could not meet, because we were not in possession of all the facts. But I know, as a member for a short while of the Colonial Development Committee some years ago, that one thing which did strike me was the sort of apathetic attitude toward the possibilities that existed as a contribution to world appeasement within these great colonial territories. I believe, interpreting the feeling of the Conference as a whole, that, taking the two things combined, the possibility of broadening the Ottawa system and of developing a great disarmed colonial Empire probably provides the best chance of offering appeasement which, if not accepted by those who desire war and aggression in this world, will appeal to that great moderate opinion which exists in all the countries which, above all, want peace rather than conflict.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

Another point is the question of social progress. Here tremendous differences of standards exist. The story told by the Indians is a pathetic one. Whether or not the small alteration in the government of India will raise the standard of living quickly is another matter, but one of the great handicaps in dealing with people and migration is this conflict of standards and social services and the difference in development that exists. I was particularly struck by the attitude of mind toward the color problem in Africa. It reminded me, only it was many times worse, of the village in England when I was a boy. The way they patronize and speak of the colored men, and their failure to recognize—indeed I do not think they do recognize—that they are humans exactly equal with themselves. This insistence upon ascendancy will, I believe, in the end be disastrous to South Africa itself. In Australia and New Zealand great progress has been made in social services. On the other hand, Canada is extremely backward, and there is an essential necessity, especially in those parts of the Commonwealth in which the white race predominates, to try to bring these standards more into conformity, in order that one may deal with the problem of the transfer of labor which is so essential for the development of these parts of the world.

With regard to migration, which is another problem dealt with in the Conference—but very lightly—I think the view he took, and strongly held, was that the problem of migration needs to be reduced to a business basis. It is quite obvious that in primary industries there is very little chance of absorbing many more people. On the other hand, these Dominions must have a balanced industry, and there-

THE COMMONWEALTH

fore it becomes a question of trade, and the question of training depends on the utilization of skilled men at home to train other men to develop these industries in the Dominions. The skilled trade of your own country can only absorb a certain number. If others are to be trained, then it is essential that it be reduced to a greater precision than it is at the present moment, so that those at home who are training the others may know that there is a draft to the Dominions annually so as not to break down their own standard at home. I believe that, if migration is rediscussed and brought down to an idea of an ordered scientific development, instead of approached with the old attitude of mind of merely sending people out because you need them for defense or because you need to get rid of them, a great contribution can be made.

Finally, I felt in the Conference that there was no desire to break up the British Commonwealth, no desire really to break away; and the underlying thought which seemed to me to be running right through was: Can we use this great association of nations—the old countries with their acknowledged experience and traditions and with all their finance, and the new countries arriving at full stature as nations—to bring about a combination, while not impinging on each other's rights, that may make a great contribution to a better world order?

3. *Co-ordination in the Empire (1939)*

Empires, as we have known them, must become a thing of the past. Nor can the mere transfer of territory from one

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

Sovereign State to another solve any of the problems of the modern world. But the conception which lies behind the Commonwealth idea, which is the antithesis of domination, is of such tremendous value to the world that all of us should concern ourselves in evolving the best method to bring it to full fruition.

That there are great divergencies it is impossible to deny. Canada is striving for national unity. This may be described by some as "bitten by nationalism," but that should not prevent us taking proper steps to ensure that, while she obtains her objective internally, Canada is maintained within the Commonwealth of Nations. South Africa has her vexed problem of racialism—a legacy of past conflicts—and the color problem, as well as territorial desires. Equally, it must be remembered that she is a vital factor in the trade routes of this country. In New Zealand and Australia the divergencies appear to be more economic than national or racial.

The pioneers of those countries commenced a trend toward collective effort, which is now being worked out in the socialization of many enterprises and services, and in the raising of labor standards far above the ideas which have permeated home policy. It is well to remember that this policy is one of continuity which has been in the process of development for many years, and nothing can be more injurious to the maintenance of the Commonwealth than lack of understanding, as depicted in the resolution recently passed by the Federation of British Industries when New Zealand found it necessary to regulate her exchanges.

THE COMMONWEALTH

Population is an imperative necessity in both these Dominions, both for defense purposes and with a view to obtaining a balanced economy, without which neither Dominion can achieve its objective. Primary production has been so mechanized during the last few decades that the possibilities of man-power absorption have been considerably reduced, while the power of this country to absorb the primary products of the world, which have increased so tremendously, is also limited. This makes it imperative that the old conception of imperialism, with its tribute to a mother country, should give way to a balanced economy, to be run on a basis which will maintain the standards of living that these new countries have built up—though even then there is bound to be a surplus of primary products to export, a market for which will have to be found in raising the standards of nutrition all over the world.

It becomes a question, therefore, of how and by what machinery this Commonwealth idea and purpose can be developed. If Europe were a Commonwealth, with a unified economy, how much better it would be for the world. It is essential that every step should be taken to prevent this collective body of individual British Sovereign States from drifting into disruption. It is true that at the present moment, with the dangers confronting the world, the need for defense may be uniting us, but one has to look beyond the present stage.

In the first place, I regard the Imperial Conference method, with all its secrecy, as out of date; it savors too much of imperialism, and of the old colonial outlook. Equally, a Federation with a Central Empire control and

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

government would be impossible. Is there an alternative?

I urge that an Assembly of the British Commonwealth be created, and that the relationships between these independent States and ourselves should rest upon the conclusions worked out by that Assembly. This would be far more satisfactory than the present improvised methods. The Assembly should be constituted from the principal parties of each State, so that its conclusions would represent a continuity, both in internal and external affairs, and would not be subject to the upsets caused by political changes in either one or other of the equal States, as might otherwise be the case. President Roosevelt set a good example in this respect in the United States delegation to the recent Lima Conference, by securing that both parties were represented.

What are the problems which would face such an Assembly? Defense is very vital. I doubt whether the Dominions or the electorate at home realize the tremendous responsibility which rests upon Great Britain for defending the whole of the territories comprising the British Empire, irrespective of the causes of the conflict which may arise. There is a growing feeling in the Dominions that the obligation of defense should rest upon the whole British Commonwealth, that its peoples should know and understand what reciprocal arrangements and commitments they are called upon to enter into, and that the old vague method of dealing with these important questions should be abolished.

Such an Assembly could arrive at declarations which would make known to the world what are the aims and purposes of this Commonwealth, such as:

THE COMMONWEALTH

A determination to maintain the right of self-government, and to join in its extension wherever possible.

The maintenance of democratic institutions.

The promotion of the human rights of labor.

A common determination to construct an economic system which would contribute universally to the raising of the standard of living.

A demonstration to the world that it does not intend to follow a narrow exclusive policy, either in defense, trade or the distribution of the world population.

The establishment of a position which would be tantamount to a nucleus for the establishment of a World Order, and an examination of the changes which would be necessary to that end.

A contribution to the solution of those problems which are preventing universal partnership within the Commonwealth, e.g., Eire. The Assembly could no doubt promote the solution of the one outstanding problem which hinders full co-operation of that country within this Commonwealth of democratic States, namely, the boundary.

It could arrive at conclusions with a view to solving the Indian problem. The safety of the realm is extremely important, and the Indian people are very conscious of this. Partnership with a League of States of this character would materially assist in a final solution of this difficulty.

The question of the control of the Dominions' own constitutions could also be dealt with. So could the problem of sovereignty, and whether it should be restricted or abolished in the interests of a wider World Order.

A common contribution could be made toward the de-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

velopment of the colonial Empire both in relation to defense, trade and the recognition of equality.

These and other internal problems could be dealt with by such an Assembly, principles formulated, and general directions given from time to time which would assist the Executives of the various States to arrive at conclusions which, with the common consent of the peoples concerned, could be given full effect.

Such an Assembly could also consider what contribution it could make toward general world appeasement. For example, it would be well worth while for the Assembly to consider whether the trade basis of the British Empire, known as the Ottawa Agreement, could be used as a means of broadening the Commonwealth basis. The Sterling Group might be invited in the first instance, an invitation being extended equally to other countries to come within its trading orbit, provided they were willing to put away war as an instrument of policy and so contribute to the removal of the fears now dominating the world, thus creating an economic attraction for the development of a wider area of Commonwealth co-operation and adhesion, instead of the present clamor for colonies.

Lastly, such an Assembly, discussing the problems affecting one third of the world's population in relation both to their internal and external affairs, and having due regard to the responsibility to the voteless millions within it, would be a great source of education and spread of knowledge to the electorates of all the States. It would assist in creating a universal understanding of each other's problems and would make a tremendous contribution toward

THE COMMONWEALTH

the removal of world fears and division, and bring back the League idea of collective effort and responsibility.

It would be a tragedy if, having carried the Empire forward into the first stages of Commonwealth organization, we in this generation failed to take the next step to develop it into a great Assembly of Sovereign States, keeping in mind a still greater conception, that of World Order.

4. *The Labor Party Conference (1939)*

I have been gravely concerned—in connection with the propaganda for Collective Security, which I support—with the lack of clear understanding as to the natural consequences of Collective Security. If Collective Security is to be made a really workable proposal there must be something for every party to secure. Even then, Collective Security can never be effective as a final custodian of the peace if it is merely based on the pooling of arms and overwhelming naval and military superiority. I used a phrase the other day, which I think is worth repeating and expresses what is in my mind. It was that “while we must see Collective Security as the principal weapon to resist aggression, we must always hitch our peace program to a real economic star.” One of the most potent causes of world disorder has been our dominant financial policy. You attack Chamberlain today, but what Chamberlain is trying to do is to fit world events into the requirements of that narrow island, the City of London. Behind Chamberlain are the bankers; they are the principal supporters of appeasement for Germany. They do not want justice for the German

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

masses—that is quite a different thing. I am anxious to prevent this Movement fighting for the preservation of the Paris Bourse, the London Stock Exchange, the Amsterdam Exchange, and Wall Street. This Movement, while building up its peace policy and resisting aggression, must do so on a basis which will ensure that in the end it achieves the salvation of the common people throughout the world.

Is not monetary deflation one of the biggest contributors to the present world problem? Is was the cause and the only reason for the Ottawa Agreement—an Agreement which, in my opinion, was one of the causes which helped to produce economic difficulties in Japan, thwarted the efforts of the progressive parties there, and led Japan into a policy which resulted in the attack upon China. Mr. Bennett, ex-Prime Minister of Canada, who was one of the main advocates of the Ottawa Agreement, speaking in London at a dinner where I happened to be a few nights ago, was expressing pride as to the effects of that Agreement; but I felt bound to call his attention to the fact that when by such an Agreement you diverted world economy and attempted to make the British Commonwealth a closed corporation, you created a number of vacuums which you are now trying to fill up with armaments or economic debris.

I want to ask the National Executive if they have considered what is to follow Peace Pacts and Collective Security. I know that all our minds are being influenced by the terrible dangers of war, but we have to carry our minds further than that, for we must make a contribution not merely to the preservation of this generation but to laying down the pathway which has to be trod by the millions yet

THE COMMONWEALTH

unborn. The course the world will take for many generations to come will to a great extent be determined by the present generation.

One of the first suggestions I would submit for consideration is the desirability of calling a British Labor Commonwealth Conference: a conference which would be organized on sound lines, with a proper agenda, and which would provide an opportunity for considering not merely how best we can resist aggression, but what contribution can be made from the vast wealth resources and opportunities of the British Commonwealth, in land, money and raw materials, toward a general solution of the economic problems of the world. There is no doubt there is abysmal ignorance throughout the Commonwealth even in our own Party, as to our respective attitudes toward these difficulties, and it would be a great thing if, in the first instance, the collective mind of Labor could be established throughout this great Commonwealth.

Another reason why I urge this is because we desire to work more closely and in harmony with the United States of America. The quickest road to the United States is probably through Canada, New Zealand, Australia, Newfoundland, and Africa, and not through Europe. On the other hand, they have vital interests in the Pacific. The peoples of these great countries are very similar, and it is as well to remember that millions of people in the United States who make up that great electorate were either driven out, or are descendants of those who were driven away, by the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

terrible state of affairs which existed in Europe. Millions of them were Irishmen, driven out by famine, and bitter memories have been handed down from father to child, and they do not want to come back. Equally, in our own Dominions there are many in a similar position, and it is well to remember also that the "National" Government represents the same classes which terrorized the old country in their day.

I suggest that possibly the quickest approach to understanding with the United States of America is for us to be willing to extend the great Commonwealth idea, in which the United States can be a partner, at least economically, even though it may involve a limitation of our sovereignty.

I have already stated my views as to what the Ottawa Agreement has done in diverting the economy of Europe and other parts of the world, but it may now be turned in a new channel and prove a useful instrument at hand for the Labor Party to use. If you seek to end it, it might cause a further disturbance. Therefore, I suggest the proper method is to expand it, and we must consider how it shall be expanded. You are building up a system of Collective Security and guarantees; and, in addition, you have a number of neutral countries who, while unable to come within that system, would be anxious to come within an economic Peace Bloc. May we not therefore find that here is an instrument of tremendous economic attraction which can be used? If we invite countries like the Scandinavian, Holland, Belgium, Russia, France, and the United States of America, and others who are willing to co-operate, to come within our preference system, would not that for the first

THE COMMONWEALTH

time result in a real pooling of the whole of the colonial empires of the world and their resources? It would bring the "Haves" together, and they would, in fact, be controlling 90 per cent of the essential raw materials of the world. They would also control 75 per cent of the world population, and, in fact, would be the great financial and money powers of the world. If you can bring them together so far as military, naval and defense equipment is concerned, is it too much to suggest that an endeavor should be made to pool them economically and so equip ourselves in the Peace Bloc with a far greater weapon than arms can give?

Having secured that, what should be our next step? Our appeal must be to the people of the aggressor countries. That appeal must be genuine, for many Germans have said to me, "All you have offered us up to now are military pacts." What have the Democracies to offer out of their great abundance?

It is well to remember that the real trouble which is disturbing the world rests primarily in Europe—between the eastern frontier of France and the western frontier of Russia, right throughout the middle of Europe—and in the East with Japan. But having pooled our arms, resources and economic power, cannot we then say, and mean it, to the people of these countries who, I believe, are as much against war as we are: "Put away your weapons of warfare, discard them as a means of bettering your conditions in life, and you can come in on the ground floor with the rest of us." We can genuinely suggest to the people of these countries that they have another alternative to the shedding

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

of blood—a far better one, and we can pilot the world along toward a World Order.

One last word, with regard to our own great colonial Empire with its 66,000,000 people. Is it realized by this Conference that for the first time in our history, in 1932, merely to be saved from the effects of monetary deflation—no other defense has ever been put forward for it—we departed from the historic tradition of the British Empire of holding colonial territories as a trust? When we departed from that tradition and imposed these tariffs we did more to upset the world than is generally understood. We must return to the position as trustee for our Colonial territories. In addition, the establishment of the Commonwealth itself and its organization having brought us to this stage, here is a chance now to settle the problem of the Colonies on an entirely different basis. Transference of territory from one great Power to another will not solve any economic problem. Neither is it any use to be hypocritical about our own position as a colonial Power. You must remember we took most of our Colonies by force, either for the raw materials we could obtain or for strategic purposes. That was the main motive. All these ideas about the interests of the natives never occurred to the nation at that time. Therefore, the transference of this or that portion of land can be of little use. The right method of approach is to deal with the great resources of the world. Then we can say to the people I have referred to earlier and to the islands in the Far East: "We have something better to offer than war can win." Show to the peoples of the world as a Movement, that while we are determined to resist aggression, at the same time the

THE COMMONWEALTH

policy we are advocating gives them all a chance for "a place in the sun" and a right to develop their standards of living. Open up all these great God-given things for the benefit of humanity. Show them that by the proper use of the instrument of peace they can achieve far more both in standard of living and economic security than war has ever been able to obtain.

15

HEALTH IN INDUSTRY

IT IS a gratification to the great Trade Union Movement that the industrial health problem is receiving much closer consideration than at any period in its history. The problem has given our movement much anxiety and has involved considerable expenditure of money and effort in bringing about investigations to secure the scheduling of industrial diseases.

With the passing of the Factories Act—although in many respects it falls short of our desires—and the placing of the industrial health problem on a more organized basis, an opportunity is presented for a really co-ordinated service which, for the first time, can be made universal in its application. We agree that a large contribution has been made by voluntary effort. It is true that it may have been introduced from a variety of motives, possibly paternal, or from the point of view of economic efficiency; or schemes may even have been conceived with an idea of handicapping our own movement. But motives do not always govern achievements or determine the effect of a course of action which may be taken. The net result has been to produce

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

sufficient evidence to enable the State, employers, and trade unions to approach this problem and place it on a more organized basis, co-ordinating all the contributing factors and linking it with a complete medical service which, if handled correctly, will become a great national asset.

If the health problem could be viewed from the point of its capital value it would be possible to arrive at a better estimate of the result to the nation of its neglect, for it must be remembered that the only capital a worker has is his skill and ability to work. Therefore, if the capital loss could be calculated in terms of depreciation, as is done in the case of machinery, the facts would be such that, applying the same result to the mechanism of a works, the industrial management would call in the best scientific and engineering ability at its command to remedy the loss. I suggest that the loss of value resulting from the lack of proper standards for the health of the worker, if it could be translated into capital, would represent a greater total than would appear under any other head. No attempt, however, has been made to calculate the actual capital value of an efficient worker, as represented in output and gain to the community. In addition, the loss is extremely far-reaching, for while a machine may depreciate, its effect is limited; but physical deterioration of the worker has a very grave repercussion upon his home, on the well-being of his family, and on his general environment.

We welcome the consideration of the industrial health problem from yet another angle. For a long time it was assumed that the main thing to be decided in the case of a worker who was ill was whether or not he was a malingerer.

HEALTH IN INDUSTRY

Practically the whole of the Workmen's Compensation Laws and restrictions associated with certain health services have been based upon the assumption that protection had to be secured against exploitation on the part of the worker, and to that extent the service has been handicapped in its outlook. I am not too sure that the attitude of the medical profession itself in the past has not been colored by this conception. Happily, however, with the growth of the study of psychology and a deeper understanding of the industrial health problem, this approach has to a large extent been changed. Housing and the habits of the people themselves have also been a great stumbling block.

Another difficulty which has handicapped us in dealing with the medical examination of workpeople has been the attitude of the people themselves toward the works doctor, and the works doctor's attitude toward the workpeople. It must be remembered that in many public services and large works the works doctor is looked upon as the person employed by the management to protect its interests. For instance, in one great undertaking if a man is away ill for a period of three weeks he must be specially examined before returning to work—not for the purpose of finding out the cause of illness, but to ascertain whether he is fit for the particular occupation upon which he is engaged. The result of this has been to create fear in the minds of the workers, and they try to get back to work within the specified period, even though they may not have fully recovered. In order to protect men undergoing medical examination my own organization has found it necessary to establish agreements making provision for the union to submit the

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

worker to a second doctor if it is not satisfied with the decision of the works doctor; then, if agreement cannot be reached, to a medical referee. While this is necessary to protect the individual, the psychological reaction on the man is not conducive to his recovery.

The same difficulty is experienced in connection with welfare work. This has been very useful in some cases where there has been a common understanding. On the other hand, where it has been introduced without the unions and in antagonism to them, it has produced quite a bad reaction. For these and many other reasons I welcome the opportunity now presented for a complete overhaul of the whole medical service and the establishment of a branch which might be designated an industrial medical service.

Another great difficulty with regard to the health factor is that before steps are taken to remedy an existing evil, one must establish a *prima facie* case by comparison with other controlled groups. This seems to be a fetish of the medical profession. The matter was brought out very clearly in the recent London bus situation. In 1928 I saw the difficulty which was arising: here was a body of men with a high physical standard of health who were beginning to show certain intensified nerve reactions different from those that had hitherto existed, and I pressed for an examination of the matter. It took me from 1928 to 1934 to get it into a position for a proper study to be made by the Industrial Health Board of the Medical Research Council, and the report of the investigation has only just been issued—in July, 1937, a period of nine years.

We want a service which will study health problems

HEALTH IN INDUSTRY

immediately they arise in industry and take measures to safeguard the health and welfare of the worker, remembering that prevention is better than cure. Very often a worker, for economic reasons, will suffer a long time before acknowledging he is ill and going to a doctor. Even then the ordinary medical practitioner has little time to study the complaint seriously, and may have only a slight idea of the effect of industrial conditions upon the health of his patient. Similarly the union, until it receives complaints from a sufficient number of its members, has little or no knowledge of the insidious development of factors undermining the health of the people. We must therefore try to ascertain the best way to take advantage of the new conception of health measures, to profit by our past experience and difficulties, and to tackle the health problem at its source.

We should be reluctant to see a new segregated medical service established. It must be remembered that while we have exerted considerable pressure to bring factory legislation up to date, the workpeople and industry generally are paying a substantial sum per annum for a medical service which, in the general view, is not yielding the results we are entitled to expect. I am hopeful that ere long the new Joint Committee of the British Medical Association and the Trade Union Congress, together with the Departments of State concerned, will examine the whole problem with the view to ascertaining the best possible form of organization to establish: (1) a co-ordinated medical service; (2) a comprehensive research organization; (3) a reorganized panel service; (4) a more rapid and practical ap-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

plication of scientific discovery to the needs of the medical service.

The bulk of medical practice in this country is concerned with industrial workers. How can this be linked with the industrial medical service we contemplate? Taking the great hospitals as a center, I should like to see the following experiment made:

- (a) Twenty or thirty medical practitioners pooling the whole of their panel patients.
- (b) The State or public authorities providing the necessary building accommodation and equipment for the setting up of a special clinic.
- (c) Each medical practitioner, while continuing as a general practitioner, having an opportunity to specialize on some phase of industrial medical work.
- (d) Works doctors participating in the work of the clinic and acting as part of the General Practitioners' Service.
- (e) Close contact between clinics, hospitals, and research institutes, and every possible facility given to the carrying out of such work.
- (f) Arrangements made for the diagnosis of the various cases to be sent to the appropriate research institution for investigation and record, and the prompt application of the most up-to-date treatment.

A better knowledge of the causes of illness in particular groups and classes of workers would soon be available. For instance, in looking over some of the last returns of the Registrar-General I find we have one of the highest tuberculosis mortality figures among dock laborers. The reason

HEALTH IN INDUSTRY

for this is a question not easily answered, but the high mortality figure is a definite fact. Is it due to the nature of the employment, to malnutrition of the workers, to irregular hours of work, to climatic conditions or exposure; or what is the reason for it? Similarly other industries have their specific diseases.

A detailed analysis and record of illnesses and diseases experienced in various sections of industry would be of tremendous value to the research institutes and to the medical service. Details could also be supplied to the various Joint Industrial Councils throughout the country with regard to the trade or industry covered, and both sides would be compelled to discuss the difficulties existing; we should then get co-operation between the lay and medical mind in the promulgation of remedies.

The Trade Unions of this country, while asking for the most efficient medical service, are more concerned with prevention than with cure. It has been a great struggle for us to secure facts and data, and I do suggest to the great medical fraternity that individualism has been one of your greatest handicaps. Can you not concentrate your efforts and co-operate with us? If this is possible, I am sure that industries will not limit their consideration to wages and hours alone. When discussing conditions of employment they will have before them a new basis upon which to work, resulting in general provisions for dealing with health problems being incorporated in the industrial structure.

As I said at the outset, our chief concern is to maintain what is, in fact, the capital value of our members, with ability to enjoy good health, preserve a high standard at

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

home, rear strong and healthy families, and avoid the waste and loss of illness.

I appeal to the great medical service and to my own people to set aside all prejudices of personal outlook and make one great combined effort to establish a really correlated service that will remove one of the blots from our civilization.

16

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

TO UNDERSTAND the part the Trade Unions are playing in the present conflict, it is necessary that there should be a realization that their action is based upon certain deep convictions. It is not merely a question of assisting a Government or co-operating with employers; our policy has been determined by a general recognition of certain great fundamental issues which are involved.

It is necessary, therefore, at the outset to understand Labor's political background, which has really been the main factor in determining our course of action in this struggle. We have never regarded the Peace following the Great War as being firmly established. We always felt as though we were living under a kind of truce, and the events of the last twenty years justify us in the opposition taken to the Peace Treaties. During the whole of that twenty years our policy has been evolved with a view to creating conditions which would enable a revision of those Peace Treaties to take place, and so avoid the present conflict. As one

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

writer has said: "The seeds of every great war are sown in the settlement of the previous war."

Labor, of sheer necessity, has been compelled to develop international understanding. Its early organization was among those trades which were involved in the export business of the country, and although it had not taken on such an organized political expression as it has done in the past twenty years, yet the necessity for international understanding and peace was always uppermost in the minds of its leaders, and several efforts were made to create international labor organizations prior to the last war. Indeed, there were even discussions then as to whether the most drastic steps could be taken to prevent war, but that was found to be impossible and beyond them.

Prior to 1914 the number of people actually represented by the Trade Union Movement was about 50 per cent of that represented today, and the number of trades organized was very limited. While there was this great desire for the prevention of war, it was not until the war came upon us that we had a full realization either of what would be involved or the part we should be called upon to play before that struggle ended. But the experiences gained both during and after the Great War were not lost upon the Trade Union Movement. Indeed, the Peace itself only emphasized how closely allied and dependent was our very existence, our wage standards, hours of labor and everything which goes to make up the standard of living, upon the establishment and maintenance of a real Peace. One which cannot be determined solely by boundaries, self-determination, racial considerations, and so on, but by the laying of such

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

an economic foundation as will allow prosperity to develop universally.

A staggering blow was delivered by the effect of the reparations and war debts on our export trade, and upon the primary producers throughout the world. The attempt made to wring from the victims certain payments soon taught Labor that you could not re-establish sound economic development if you superimposed upon the machine of trade this artificial weight of debt. In fact, the bloc that it created to a real exchange produced irreconcilable conditions throughout the world.

A second economic factor soon made itself apparent: the splitting up of Europe into a large number of small States, without any economic federation, resulted in tariff walls, the development of a narrow nationalist outlook, and the breaking up of the Trade Union Movement in Europe into small entities. This, in turn, produced a tremendous disparity in wage conditions, standards of living, hours of labor, and handicapped the re-establishment of a proper equilibrium.

There was the solatium which came out of the Treaty of Versailles, which we hoped would prevent the worst happening in this respect, and that was the setting up of the International Labor Office. Great hopes were raised and, indeed, the I. L. O. accomplished great success. But the politicians, diplomats and statesmen never appreciated that if Peace was to be realized in this new world these new labor factors must become a primary concern, instead of the poor orphan. There was a complete failure to grasp the essential fact that you could not regulate price levels or

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

maintain international stability in trade by monetary means or by any of the old methods which functioned before the war. Had there been an understanding of this fact and the possibilities that lay open to the world through this institution, either by the States, by management or by the employers, and a real start had been given to it, there was nothing in the Treaty which could have made a greater contribution to a new economic stability.

To add to our troubles in resettling at the end of the Great War and developing the necessary equilibrium, we had to grapple with the terrible effects of deflation which again accentuated the difficulty between the primary producer and the manufacturer. In its operation it caused such disturbance that, together with the war debts, the result was that unemployment rose to nearly three million in this country alone, giving industry the impossible task of arriving at proper conditions, wages, and so on, upon a post-war basis. In fact, we had pre-war minds trying to handle a post-war problem, and this should be taken as a warning in the future.

We welcomed the establishment of democratic government in Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia. We wanted to encourage it. To this end we made our contribution very quickly to assist in producing stability at the end of the war. We buried the feelings and antagonisms which had arisen as a result of hostilities and proceeded to establish the International Federation of Trade Unions.

At the end of about six months we had established Secretariats for many of the great trades, and we proceeded to try to examine the post-war industrial problems, endeavor-

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

ing to make proposals which would have minimized competition and have healed a good many of the wounds, and by the right kind of appeasement, namely, the rebuilding of a decent standard of living, regulating hours of labor internationally and in a variety of other ways, we sought to get the world moving on a new post-war plane.

But one of the great tragedies, both in Middle Europe and indeed all over the world, was that while Labor was struggling to find an economic solution, which needed united action, the political activity of the States was making for separatism. We realized, probably more forcibly than ever before, the necessity of making the League of Nations a real living force and utilizing to the full the Covenant, thereby establishing such measures of collective security which would give confidence. As a Labor Movement, we supported the Protocol of 1924; we were satisfied that you could not create the necessary condition of mind unless security was given to France. Late in the day this nation has arrived at that opinion, but it does demonstrate how far-seeing the Trade Union and Labor Movement was then.

We regarded the foregoing as necessary to enable a system to be formulated regarding disarmament, which we felt must be on the basis of absolute equality between victor and vanquished.

When the situation is surveyed by the historian it does, in my view, merit being written down as the greatest effort ever made for Peace; and although we failed for a variety of reasons, Europe will have to come back to it as an alternative to the balance of power policy, power politics, and

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

so forth, if we are to achieve the correct economic development and save the world from the doom of recurring wars.

The second financial crash, together with the unemployment in the world, almost produced despair in our hearts. But we tried with resolute determination to ameliorate the position by attempting internationally to reduce the hours of labor, so that instead of keeping a reserve of unemployment for a section of our working population our aim was to keep a reserve of hours of labor spread over the whole. Had this plan been adopted we should have saved the capital value of the skill of our people, which is so essential today, instead of allowing it to be wasted in special and derelict areas, and I am convinced that if we could have proceeded to build up, particularly in Europe, a new economic order, Hitlerism would never have achieved power. Our plan failed; we could not get agreement, and without agreement progress could not be made. Political considerations, lack of confidence and many other factors contributed to its failure.

The coming of Hitler, however, made further progress in this realm impossible. One of the Articles of the Versailles Treaty most valued by us was that establishing the Rights of Free Association. I doubt if there is a full comprehension of how much our liberties, which you are now fighting to preserve, depend upon the maintenance of this principle.

The first act of aggression by Hitler was the wiping out of the Trade Unions and the violation of that Article of the Versailles Treaty, yet this was one part of the Treaty which was not objected to by the Reich at the time of signature.

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

No protest was made in connection with this violation by any of the Powers, the middle classes, or any other section of the community excepting ourselves. But it was the first act of aggression. I emphasize this because the rights of free association will have to be re-established again universally and, in future, there will have to be as much adherence to the maintenance of this principle as there is to any other part of the Peace Treaty. This act of aggression, and the absence of protest, was the real forerunner of the other acts of aggression which followed. It is as well to ask that this situation be faced frankly, for at the time this Article was violated by Hitler it was not unwelcome to a large number of business interests in other countries. Gibes passed across the table to us, that perhaps a little of the same medicine would not be bad for us. The Krupps and Thyssens subscribed their money to Hitler largely for this purpose. Had Hitler stopped there and merely destroyed working-class organizations we are forced to the conclusion that we should have been left to protest alone. But the Nazi regime has demonstrated that it is no respecter of persons, whether they represent Trade Unions, economic, religious, racial or capitalist interests; and very soon the persecution and confiscation reached the people who had supplied the money and sinews of war, and they now find themselves exiles.

Unfortunately, most of our friends, who were the first victims of Hitlerism, had no chance of being exiles, but suffered the tortures of the concentration camps.

Whatever may be our views about the wealth of the country, the capitalist system or about management, we assert

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

that any regime which denies to the working people their liberty to establish organizations to defend their interests, and which have for their object the defense of the standard of living and the rights of the common people, must be resisted by the trade unionists of this and every other country. It is striking that every Labor Movement in the world is against Hitlerism.

The reason is not far to seek, for we have, step by step, and in a variety of ways, by steady evolution of the State itself, by municipal development, by social services, education and in many other ways, been building a social democratic structure within the State without losing any of our liberty. There has been a narrowing of the social caste, and I am convinced that this war will see that process accelerated. For that reason we accept the democratic philosophy. It is sometimes said it is slower in its action, but it is far more sure, and Government by Consent has given greater results to the masses of people than has any other method, whether it be the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the Nazi regime, or the Fascist State. It is perhaps difficult to find an illustration, but if I may interpose here: I venture to assert that if the Nazi regime had not developed in Germany and if the great rearmament race had not commenced, the drive that was taking place at the moment of the arrival of Hitlerism for economic reconstruction would have placed the Germans in a better position than has been possible under the Nazi regime, with its "guns instead of butter"; while the spiritual relationship between the nations would have been on a much higher plane.

Therefore, we approached this war from the democratic

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

point of view, and we assert that the maintenance of Democracy gives us another reason for resisting dictatorship aggression.

We expressed our full acceptance of these principles in our contribution to the League of Nations, and the support we gave the Government when they decided upon Sanctions in the case of Abyssinia. We went further than any other section of the community and faced the extreme risk that it involved. We were convinced that you could not appease the dictators.

This brings me to the point of the introduction of rearmament in this country, and I readily admit there was a great divergence of opinion. When people have struggled so hard for peace, it is a violent shock to have to swing over to intensify the production of the implements of war, but so far as the Trade Unions were concerned the position was faced honestly. But it was not rearmament in itself that caused the difficulty. We knew from the beginning that the Nazi policy was ultimately to use force to gain their end. What did hinder development was the foreign policy of those in power, its uncertainty, a belief that there was a tenderness toward Nazism, the attitude of the Government in the Spanish conflict, and the fear, which has not yet been completely eradicated, that if it suited the great financial interests they would make terms with the Nazis. To put it simply—the fear of Munich. A clear political understanding at an earlier date as to what was the real objective of our foreign policy, would have created confidence and allowed advances to be made sooner. A course which might have caused others to pause.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

The lack of understanding influenced all parties, and consultation with the Unions was tabooed by the Government at that time. When we were called into consultation we submitted suggestions as to how these problems of labor might be handled in times of war and endeavored to reduce them down to a very simple form. These were the suggestions:

A National Committee for each industry where joint negotiating machinery at present exists. The National Committee to consist of, or to be formed by, the national bodies responsible for the joint negotiating machinery.

The National Committee to decide whether or not there should be local or regional committees, or whether they should operate through the national machinery, or, alternatively, become parties to local tribunals or special local committees;

The Government should notify the Committee of the needs of the industry, and of priority orders. It would be the duty of such committee to evolve the best system of utilizing labor in time of war, and to determine the machinery for dealing fully with the question of transference of labor in a war emergency;

Each National Industrial Committee would have to see to the machinery for dealing with wages, hours and conditions;

The Minister of Labor should have power to make agreements binding on employers not parties to such machinery. Trade Board powers to be extended to include all conditions of service;

The principle of collective bargaining to be accepted by

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

the Government and made applicable to all industries;

An Advisory Committee, consisting of equal numbers of trade unionists and employers (to be appointed by the Minister of Labor), and Civil Service representatives of the Government, to be set up to co-ordinate the work of the National Committee.

It will be well to consider them for the moment.

Prior to the outbreak of the last war there were many industries which had not established joint machinery at all; but the present day position is quite different, and in the suggestions we made industry would practically be covered. That is to say, while the Trade Unions represent about 5,500,000 workers, the actual wage agreements and Trade Board machinery cover over 10,000,000 workers. We therefore contended that here was a ready instrument which, if it had added to it other responsibilities and duties to assist the State, could quickly be brought into operation to assist in carrying out the great task that lies ahead of us.

It was rather regrettable that these suggestions were left over until after the war broke out, and the whole of the suggestions have either not yet been accepted or, due to the creation of a number of Departments, have taken various other forms.

If I may deal with wages first: In the last war it was necessary to establish arbitration tribunals, and there was a constant pressure to get wages adjusted. This caused difficulty between the various classes of labor and created an inability to adjust the relationships upon a correct basis, as between the different grades of labor. In addition to dealing with other vexed problems at that time, people

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

were brought into the various industries and put into positions over the heads of those who had been in the industry all their lives. This resulted in threatened disputes right throughout the period of the Great War.

During the past twenty years much experience had been gained from the joint negotiating machinery, Whitley Councils, Conciliation Boards, and so on, and what is more important, there was not now the desire to limit the discussions in the fear that their managerial functions were being invaded, which used to exist in the old days. Or, in other words, in many of the Councils there is scarcely a matter, whether it be costs, manipulation of labor, health, welfare of the workers, or anything else, that is ruled out of the discussions. It therefore seemed advisable that the machinery, with all its wealth of experience, should be used rather than to go back to the improvised methods used in the last war. So far as statutory machinery is concerned, we simply urged that it should be broadened and speeded up in its procedure.

Having the vexed question of wage adjustments to deal with, we submitted a proposal to the Government that they should control prices. That, in itself, would prevent any panic action upon the question of wages, and we suggested that the difference in cost should be met by the Exchequer. To some extent, Labor's suggestion has been adopted.

But it must be remembered that prior to the war many industries had been in the doldrums; wages had been terribly depressed; and with the increased prosperity, wages in those industries would have had to be adjusted.

In any case, apart from cost of living, where industries

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

are enjoying prosperity, we are entitled to adjust wages in the usual way.

But we believe that the steadiness with which this problem has been dealt with has made for stability and rapid progress in production, which is a tribute to the effectiveness of the joint machinery now operating.

We are very deeply concerned about introducing into the wage system legislative enactments of a compulsory character, whether they deal with savings or in any other way interfere with the lives of the workpeople, thus producing conditions which would be very difficult to control. The Trade Unions are wedded to the idea of a "rate for the job," and whatever people's views may be about family allowances it would have to be introduced as a social service and an addition to the rate for the job. We are determined at all costs to resist the Means Test business in industry.

Then the Unions have had the vexed question of dilution to face, and I think the steps taken to deal with it by joint negotiations on this occasion are a credit to those who have had this problem to face. It is as well that the public should appreciate what the skilled man is being asked to do. He has had to serve an apprenticeship or period of training, and very often his parents have made great sacrifices to enable him to do so. The craftsmanship of the worker is equal to that of any of the professions, but he is now asked to train another who, at any moment, with the termination of war and resultant unemployment, will become his competitor, and who, if great care is not exercised, can be used to destroy his standard of living and what is really his capi-

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

tal. The term "dilution," and what it involves, is not understood by the public as it should be. I have often wondered whether the higher professions would, with the same alacrity and with as little fuss, have agreed to such relaxation, as the Unions have now done in the interests of the nation.

I hope when this war terminates and the necessity for dilution has passed that everyone connected with management will feel they have a debt of honor to repay in relation to the question of dilution. It is not sufficient that a Cabinet Minister should promise certain things. It is a matter for the management as well, for it must always be remembered that this could not have been done by law. Parliament could have carried all the Acts it wished but unless there were voluntary acquiescence on the part of the men, such a scheme could not be worked. No greater opportunity will ever present itself to employers and management than they will have at the end of the present war, to demonstrate that the confidence which has been reposed in the agreement reached has not been misplaced.

Then we are faced with the problem of the employment of women. Our claim is, that if women are carrying out the work of men they should be paid the rate for the job.

I hope that if these temporary expedients have to be taken, the women who have been in the industries will be promoted and others brought in behind them to follow on with their work, and that they shall each be paid the rate for the job, whether it has been hitherto carried out by a man or a woman.

With regard to consultations with Government Departments, apart from the Ministry of Labor there did appear,

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

at the beginning, to be some reluctance to admit the Trade Unions into the inner sanctums. Whether it was prejudice, ignorance or foolishness one cannot tell, but that was soon remedied and labor has now appointed its representatives upon practically all the controls of the various departments or is invited in a consultative capacity. It is also represented, together with the employers and the State, upon the Joint Committee of the Ministry of Supply for the purpose of serving the respective regions, and with a view to bringing into play every possible works and service which can be used in the interests of the nation and its struggle.

There is also the question of the recruitment of skilled labor for Government work being made from men in the employ of Public Utilities, Public Authorities and others, who have certain pension and superannuation rights. We suggested months ago that the Government should at once take steps by legislation to protect the rights of those workers so that they would feel secure if they undertook to transfer to Government work. In certain cases it has been possible to obtain a guarantee of this character from employers. For instance, in the case of the London Passenger Transport Board, I was able to arrive at an arrangement with them whereby they would give a certificate to their employees desiring to undertake munition work which would enable the employee to be taken back by the Board with his seniority, superannuation and other rights intact, when his services were no longer required by the State. These may appear to be small things, but they give a sense of confidence to the men, and we cannot understand the delay in its adoption.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

The question of the great building trade development and the transfer of labor necessary has been worked out by the industry through their joint bodies in a manner and with a speed which I am quite certain, from my knowledge of what is going on in Germany with all their controls and powers, cannot be equaled by that country. Still further progress could be made if the Government would take a more enlightened view as to what was really necessary and would move more quickly.

The building trade has worked out a Lodging Allowance and Traveling Scheme, which is very essential, having regard to the fact that the men have to keep two homes going while traveling around. But a considerable time has been allowed to elapse before its adoption and work is hindered in consequence.

In the case of agriculture, both before and since the war began, the Unions have been associated with every effort to produce food, regulate labor conditions, and maintain the labor forces on the proper level for this purpose. They have been responsible for inducing the Government to carry the new legislation, and we are hoping the time is not far distant when a proper equilibrium between the wages and conditions of the urban and country worker will have been established.

In the case of transport, we have had to face the possibility of aerial and other attacks and the closing of the East Coast ports, with the maintenance of the supplies of the country from the West.

My Union has undertaken the task of arranging the transference of men to the required areas, and in conjunction

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

with this plan a scheme of lodging allowances, and so on, has been worked out, accommodation is being registered and all this is taking place without any compulsory powers at all. If the enemy is successful in causing a temporary cessation of transport facilities in any port in the country, then the waterside worker will be transferred with such speed that there will be little delay in the distribution of the necessary goods to keep the country going. Happily, due to the success of the Navy, Air Force, Mercantile Marine, trawlersmen and everyone concerned with the Defense Services, it has not yet been necessary to use this Transference Scheme.

A striking illustration of the ready response of men to serve the nation was when the magnetic mine had to be grappled with. The Admiralty asked for 200 trawlers and crews; within a few hours every crew which had been asked to serve had responded, but, alas! there had been such neglect that over 50 per cent of the vessels were found to be unfit for the purpose required.

In the manning of the estuary defenses, our watermen, lightermen, tugboatmen and everyone who has been necessary because of his expert knowledge, have left their former employment and undertaken these duties for our protection, and there are many other examples one could quote.

The Transport Unions, including the Seamen's Union, were constantly worrying the Government about the difficulties which would arise in the event of hostilities, so far as the Mercantile Marine was concerned.

We pointed out that it had had the highest turnover of

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

labor of any industry in the country, over 15,000 entering and leaving it annually. We urged that it should be converted into a career, that it should become pensionable, that holidays should be given, accommodation overhauled, etc. But the tragedy was that it was left until war broke out. It is to the credit of the Seamen's and Mercantile Unions that, notwithstanding all these refusals, they have assisted in training men to maintain the great Mercantile Marine during hostilities. Stewards and others should have been trained in peacetime and been ready for the jobs.

In the case of shipbuilding, we had deputations to the Board of Trade calling attention to the necessity of drawing up shipbuilding programs prior to the war.

Long before the war we submitted Training Schemes to the Government, in order that there might be an adequate supply of personnel in the event of hostilities. We urged that the canals and waterways should form an auxiliary part of the transport services of the country, and that they should be utilized to the fullest possible extent, so that in the case of necessity they can be brought into full play.

In relation to the coastwise services, we have made strong representations on the problems of war insurance, cost of running, and other factors, so that they may be maintained to the full.

We have made a considerable contribution by submitting proposals for a properly reorganized road transport system. We have endeavored to induce the Government to see that road transport is put upon such a basis, that while serving its normal commercial purposes, it can readily be adapted in the event of any internal disturbance of trans-

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

port resulting from enemy action. The railways are static, they can be bombarded. Road transport is more flexible, and we have urged that this problem shall be lifted above the mere consideration of vested interests.

The Government are now considering the matter largely on the lines upon which we have been working, but it is a matter which should have been dealt with earlier, for the internal transport system of the country is a very vital factor in defense. In Germany it is one of their weakest links, and small though our country may be, it is extremely important that the transport system should be complete. We, as Unions associated with the transport services, have done our best to get appreciation of this fact.

In Civilian Defense, the Unions were called in by the Minister of Home Security to assist in the organization of the whole of the A. R. P. Services, Auxiliary Fire Service, Demolition Squads, and so on, and all the conditions associated therewith were carefully examined. It is gratifying to record that in the case of no local authority of the country has there been any lack of response upon the part of permanent employees, as well as other volunteers, in responding to the appeal to man these vital services.

We have, of course, had to pay attention to the social problems associated with this war effort.

The Home Office took powers under the Emergency Powers (Defense) Realm Act to relax Factory Laws, and immediately there was a rush upon the part of certain employers to take advantage, not always I am afraid in the interests of the country, but sometimes for competitive purposes.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

When the law is laid aside in this way it imposes a great obligation upon the Unions and the employers to see that it is not abused. Here again, the greater co-operation there is between the management and the Unions on a basis of confidence, the more likely it will be that abuse will not take place and the health and well-being of the worker will be protected.

This was a matter which had to be dealt with between the Government and the Unions in great detail. The position of each industry had to be carefully examined and one had to be guided by the interests of the industry as well as the claims of the Services. In some instances, the taking of certain employees would have been better left alone, but there has been less difficulty than in the previous war. The system which has been followed between the Trade Unions and the Government in the examination of this problem has, on the whole, worked very smoothly.

It has been necessary to raise the question of Workmen's Compensation, and some improvement is now proposed. It is vital that with the increased cost of living there should be no niggardliness in dealing with this problem of injuries. The essential thing is to see that the person concerned shall receive an amount which will enable him or her to get such nutrition as will enable them to come back to their occupation as quickly as possible. This is the first principle which should be followed in dealing with this matter.

We have constantly urged the Government to introduce what would better be described as an industrial Superannuation Scheme. We were willing to recommend the payment of higher contributions from the workpeople to secure

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

a flat-rate increase of benefit, so that not only when the war is on but when the problem of readjusting labor comes up at the end of war and many men now retained over the age of sixty-five years will have to be put off work, the Fund would have accumulated and the pension scheme would have been a material help in making an adjustment at that time.

The Government has, however, preferred the Means Test method which, from our point of view, is regrettable. However, it is not too late now if those responsible for management, who will have the problem of readjustment to face at the end of the war, will assist in trying to induce the State to put this upon a proper footing.

Our people have rendered the local authorities and the Government tremendous assistance in all the localities with the problem of evacuation and all its complications.

Another important matter carried through on behalf of the workpeople was in connection with the rationing of meat. Advice was given to the Government, and readily accepted, that there should be no rationing of meat in the canteens and places where the workpeople have to feed. First, on the grounds of the speed of service, for where thousands have to be catered for in a short time it would cause great delay. Second, this method of communal feeding is economical and to a considerable extent gets over the difficulty in relation to the classes of workers who are on heavy work, etc.

In this war it is in the interests both of industry and the Nation that the employers should consider the extension of facilities for communal feeding wherever possible. This

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

will be more vital than ever where women have to be brought into industries, many of whom are married.

We are carefully studying the whole question of the hours of work, lighting, ventilation and health services.

The workpeople have carried through with the difficulties of the black-out in a remarkable manner. The high point of efficiency reached under these difficult circumstances merits the thanks of the community, but it must not be accepted that if this war lasts a long time the workers will be able to face the same conditions winter by winter. Irritation will grow. The long hours will cause a weakening of resistance and ill health, and it is essential to find an economic point of hours beyond which physical endurance should not be expected to go. Also, in every factory where black-outs have had to be introduced the period of light days should be used to improve the position for the coming winter.

Space will not permit me to deal with all the activities, and the foregoing must be taken as examples. But the essential fact is that Labor has contributed voluntarily and we are convinced that the Nazi regime can be defeated without the introduction of compulsory measures affecting labor in the industry of this country.

I have said sufficient to illustrate that the range of this voluntary work is of no mean character. We have not been content merely with activities in the national field. I mentioned at the outset that our Movement is international in character. We have maintained our contacts with the Labor Movements in the Dominions. The International Federation of Trade Unions is being maintained in full working order,

TRADE UNIONS AND THE WAR

and this brings us into close contact with the Labor Movement in neutral countries. In addition, there has been established an Anglo-French Committee, which has brought the French Trade Unions and the British Trade Unions into close collaboration. There was the danger of a good deal of misunderstanding owing to the Labor policy of France as against the industrial wage policy of this country, but the exchange of views, the explanations given and the passing of information one to the other have produced accord and understanding and this, in itself, is of vital importance in the conduct of this great struggle.

We have continued to insist that the International Labor Organization shall proceed with as much work as it possibly can. That it shall be maintained intact and that it shall hold together those democratic trade union movements which exist throughout the world.

Then, both through the International Federation of Trade Unions and the International Labor Office we have been brought into contact with the Labor Movement in the United States of America as well as in the South American States.

I once said that the Trade Union Movement has now become an integral part of the State. I meant this in the sense that while it is a voluntary organization, it has established for itself a place which has made it indispensable to the smooth working of modern democracy.

17

THE WORKERS' ADVOCATE

1. *Extracts from Evidence on Working Conditions and Wages (1920)*

OUR last set of negotiations was in connection with a 44-hour week, and I have heard that it has been said that the employers claim this as an advance of wages. I want to put before you the history of that shorter working week. We had prepared that program in 1913 and in 1914; as a historical fact, the Triple Alliance was formed of the Miners, the Railwaymen, and ourselves. We all had bitter experience, and knew the type of fight we would have to meet. We did not want it, I can assure you, and if there had been a ready means of conciliation at our hand at that time we should probably never have thought of it. We had our bitter experience in 1912 of people driven to starvation and suicide over that bitter strike, in London particularly; and we had to get the necessary machinery to prevent so prolonged a struggle taking place again. But when the war

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

broke out we were appealed to by the State to forego all those negotiations. We were asked, "Do not press your claims now when the country is in the throes of danger," and we said, "Very good," and we withdrew our claim. As a matter of fact, we had not actually sent it to the employers, but we had it ready. The whole of us worked patriotically, as you know. I do not use the word "patriotically" in the vulgar sense, and in fact I would like not to use it, it has been so abused, and I only use it for want of another word.

We submitted to the requests and we postponed any discussion until the end of the war. We kept our word. We did not submit the demand for the shorter working week until after the Armistice was signed. In December of the year before last, 1918, we submitted our request and it was negotiated and finally a 44-hour week was established, together with another very substantial improvement in the life of the docker, and that was a guaranteed half day in place of the old hourly system.

The docker who is distributing goods is contributing as much to the national well-being as the capitalist who is manipulating money or handling shares, or anything of that character. He is performing a real service—a real service to the State when he is handling these goods—but they say he is unskilled. I have seen the bricklayer building the houses and I have seen the docker stowing the ship, and I am an impartial person because I have done neither, but I have watched both, and with all the variety of classes of goods that have to go into a ship, and it has to sail on very uncertain seas, with the men's lives depending on their

THE WORKERS' ADVOCATE

stowing it correctly—there is as great skill in the hold of a ship as in any other industry that I know; and therefore I feel particularly strongly, even, if I may use the term, on the animal basis, I have been a driver of horses, and I have learned that there are two ways of getting a horse to go: one is to feed him, stable him, clean him, harness him well and comfortably, and you do not need a whip; the other is to starve him and use a whip. I am pleading for the first method as the best method for carrying on the industry of this country.

I have shown, or tried to show, that labor has growing aspirations. I have tried to show that cultural development is as much to us as it is to the middle or to the upper classes. They are building us houses containing one living room, which I consider is an insult to us, an insult to our people. The old parlor may have been disused, but it will be the workman's library of the future. The houses that will be built now must stand for years; and imagine the conception of the architect, the conception of the sociologist, who thinks that a workman can develop his brain, his education, his knowledge, his social life, in a room with all the children around him and the domestic difficulties and all the rest of it. They will not even build a house to give him a decent place for study and culture. What would our captains of industry think if with their families they had to sit in one room and do all their business, read all their books, and study all their music or their other arts? They want culture, they want leisure, they want their home, and we want the same; and we claim it, and if our people have not been educated up to the appreciation of these arts, yet

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

the day is coming when they will be; and I want them to have a chance for their proper development. But if the employer says in spite of all this that we have not established our claim, you have one alternative; you must go to the Prime Minister, you must go to the Minister of Education, and tell him to close our schools, tell him that industry can only be run by artisan labor on the pure fodder or animal basis, teach us nothing, let us learn nothing, because to create aspirations in our minds, to create the love of the beautiful, and then at the same time to deny us the wherewithal to obtain it, is a false policy and a wrong method to adopt. Better keep us in dark ignorance, never to know anything, if the employers are going to refuse labor the wherewithal to give expression to those aspirations which have thus been created.

2. *Speech on the Forty-Hour Week (1933)*

The resolution which I have been asked to move on behalf of the Workers' Group is a very definite and clear resolution. It is intended to express the desire that the task of drafting a Convention for the 40-hour week should be proceeded with, but in the drafting of that Convention and in the technical considerations associated with it, we want the terms of reference to those concerned to be equally definite and that in the consideration of the problem there shall be maintained the present standard of living as expressed by present monetary wages and salaries as a minimum.

I think that is quite clear with regard to the intention of

THE WORKERS' ADVOCATE

the Workers' Group. We have therefore first of all to address ourselves to the practicability, as well as the desirability, of a Convention. I always feel that the practicability of a thing is determined by the will of the people who are called upon to carry it out. If there is no will it is comparatively easy to say that a thing is impracticable. It is true that our one day's rest in seven as expressed by our Sunday—in the West at least—is due very largely to religious observance, but as I have sat in this Conference during the last ten days I have tried to imagine what the argument would have been by the various opponents of a shorter working week if one day's rest in seven had had to be submitted to a Conference of this character. We should have the British Government opposing it, notwithstanding that these religious observances have been in the world for a number of years—at least we can account for five thousand. One day's rest in seven established for five thousand years. Two days' rest in seven, with all the scientific development, is regarded by our employers as Utopian. The crux of the question, however, is this. If poverty and unemployment were bred from famine, I could understand the employers' speeches, but poverty is bred now from a plethora. The world is suffering from too much and not from too little. Those who were speaking for the employers, and very largely I assume, for the British employers, opposed the legal regulation of hours on the grounds of impracticability, but I want to question whether that was really the motive.

Everybody knows, I suppose, that what was known as the British plan of finance, with London as the financial center

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

of the world, was always opposed to the legal regulation of hours and wages, even at the time when we were trying to stop the most terrible sweated conditions in our country, not because of its impracticability but because the center of finance of the world has always held that wages must be flexible, so that the system of usury for which it is responsible can operate without let or hindrance.

I suspect that the representative of the British employers is in this Conference today not to speak the mind of the real men who have to run industry but in close alliance with those who dominate industry, the financiers and capitalists of our country. He spoke about frankness; so will I. The fact that supports me in my contention is this, that when the world crisis was approaching, his organization did not call upon the rich to economize; instead, they issued a pamphlet calling upon our Government to take the bread from the unemployed and to destroy the social services of our country.

I therefore say that it is not the question of impracticability which is behind their argument; they have not been frank when advancing that statement. It is the experience in our country which convinces me that the legal regulation of wages, the legal regulation of minimum conditions, the legal protection of our people all over the world with regard to hours, are always opposed on the grounds of the desirability of what is called flexibility in wage conditions.

Our resolution asks that we proceed with the drafting of the Convention because it will be a contribution to the solution of the unemployment problem. In advancing that proposition, I should like to call your attention to the fact that

THE WORKERS' ADVOCATE

poverty has always been the lot of the real producers; as you go higher up the scale the lower the hours become, and that is due to the feudal conception of life.

In the nineteenth century we struggled to raise the standard of living. Since the War we have struggled to raise the standard of living in our country. We have had to fight every inch of the way, and every time we have tried to make an advance in any country what have we been told? We have been told that if only we could do it internationally there would be no opposition from the employers. During the last six months I have been in negotiation with numbers of employers in Great Britain, and all of them have admitted that, even if trade revives to the highest possible point, they cannot take all the unemployed back into industry. They admit that there must be a shortening of hours. They say to me: "Can you get it done internationally?" That is what they say in conference at home, but when I come to Geneva to try to do it, they send their representative here to vote against it and to oppose it on every possible occasion. There is a lack of sincerity in the conference room at home, or else we have not straight dealing here in this room.

Then it is said that you cannot enforce it, and that that is another reason for its impracticability. But you can establish international cartels, and, if you are establishing international cartels, why cannot the basis of agreement be labor conditions as well as finance and spheres of influence? Why should it be limited purely to the question of selling prices and the question of spheres of influence, without embodying labor conditions as well?

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

I suggest that the Convention will be found to be practicable and to be desirable from the point of view that in fact it will not increase costs of production. History is against the employers on this point. I well remember when the Minimum Wage legislation was introduced into our country every employer said it would increase the cost of production and would therefore destroy the industries to which it applied. I challenge the Ministry of Labor representative to deny that every industry which was brought under the Minimum Wage conditions and the regulation of hours under that legislation was more prosperous afterward than it was under the old *laissez faire* conditions which existed before.

You cannot, therefore, judge what is going to happen under a Convention by what exists at present, because every industrial negotiator knows that immediately a collective agreement is signed or a law is passed, industry begins to readapt itself to the new conditions. Moreover, if you can increase the consuming power of the public, the greater encouragement to the production of consumable goods reduces overhead expenses and the cost of production per unit of production.

Again, it is said that so far as transport, which I particularly represent, is concerned, the resolution would be impracticable. I regard transport, which is probably one of the greatest absorbers of capital goods in the world, as being really only in its infancy. Why? The transport system in the nineteenth century and in the early part of the twentieth century catered largely, so far as travel was concerned, for a limited class of the community. With the rais-

THE WORKERS' ADVOCATE

ing of the standard of living all over the world, the increased amount of leisure and the greater purchasing power, if there is one industry that is bound to advance and to quadruple its activities and its demands, it is the transport system of the world, both internal transport and shipping.

Then it is argued that we must not do anything because of the Economic Conference. Here I want to come to grips with the whole conception of the part which labor and industrial organizations ought to play in relation both to the Monetary Conference and to the World Economic Conference.

If there was one disaster that happened to my country—and I think the employers in this Conference will not deny it—it was that the British Government in 1921 and in 1925 decided monetary policy, and to return to the gold standard without any regard to the effect upon wages or industrial conditions. The experts for the Monetary Conference are sitting in this building. Who is to guide them as to what they should cater for under the regime of industrialization which is bound to exist following the present industrial revolution? We have argued that money should be the handmaid of industry and not its master. No industrialist will dispute this. Then I suggest that this Conference ought to determine the industrial policy it is going to follow and the Monetary Conference should adapt its monetary requirements to the new industrial conditions which the International Labor Office is endeavoring to work out. Unless the World Economic Conference knows the basis upon which industry is to be organized for the future, what has it

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

to guide it? Of whom will it consist? Mainly politicians. Who should guide politicians? This Conference, and it should lay the foundation upon which they should reconstruct and re-arrange economic requirements. I ask this Conference to have some amount of dignity and not to be merely content to wait for others to shape our policy and then try to adapt ourselves to it. Surely the Governments and Departments responsible for the well-being and social advancement of our people ought to be laying that foundation.

Then we have been asked this week to demonstrate the impracticability of a Convention and the difficulty of its enforcement. Well, for over thirteen years, in my own country, I have been urging—and I ask the Governments to take particular notice of this point—that when fixing commercial agreements labor should receive more consideration. In my own country at the moment our Government is in negotiation, I believe, with twenty different countries to discuss new commercial agreements. Such issues as the most-favored-nation clause will arise. When commercial treaties have been discussed in the past labor has not been considered at all, and why should not the basis of a commercial treaty and the operation of the most-favored-nation clause be associated at least with the minimum conditions laid down by the International Labor Office, both in hours and wages, as a criterion of a willingness to enforce it and a willingness to adopt it?

Then we are told that there is difficulty in drafting a Convention because of the problem of Asia. Well, I cannot

THE WORKERS' ADVOCATE

understand the employers, because is it not true that the employers (particularly the British employers) and the British Government have consistently urged that Asia should be given different conditions from the rest of the world, and when you have done it you use it as an argument against drafting a Convention now. We are trying at present in Great Britain to give India a Constitution. I think I speak with a knowledge of the desires of the poor of India, and I suggest that they will look with favor upon a Convention coming from Geneva that is going to raise their standard of life and give them a chance to rise in the social scale. This Conference has possibly the last chance it will ever have to raise the standard of life in India and so to influence the whole of Asiatic conditions, and bring them into closer conformity with Western standards of civilization. Therefore, in our view, the universal reduction of hours and the preparation of a Convention would not widen the margin between the competitive countries, because every time you reduce hours and increase leisure you develop a new desire for culture, and the very fact that toil is reduced will tend to narrow the margin that exists between the countries at the present moment.

Agriculture has been advanced as a reason why we should not proceed to draft a Convention. There is a tremendous demand for agricultural products in all the great industrial countries at the present time, if only the people had the wherewithal to buy them. There would be no surplus of agricultural products if the standard of living of the industrialists were sufficient to absorb them. I do not want

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

agriculture to be the Cinderella of the great world industries. I represent over 20,000 agricultural workers in my own country, in my own Union.

The agricultural workers have always had to work to provide for the overlord rather than to provide for the great community. Here again, what right have the employers to advance this argument when, for ten years in this International Labor Organization, there are those who have strenuously opposed the bringing of agriculture within the ambit of our Conventions, with the object of bringing agricultural workers nearer to industrial conditions?

I come now to the second part of the resolution, that dealing with wages. It has been asked what the workers mean by wages, whether it means that 40 hours is the standard when one person is on 40 hours and another on 48? No, it is not that. If, under collective agreements or the law in any country the wages for 48 hours' work are one shilling an hour, we mean quite definitely that 48 shillings should be paid for 40 hours, and that that should be the new rate per hour divided by forty. We also mean that piece-work earnings should be adjusted so that in 40 hours workers will be able to earn the same as they do now in 48. This demand is based on reasons of justice, for the workers have given the world production and have also suffered a reduction of wages. The workers cannot buy what they produce unless they are given the wherewithal to purchase it.

We feel that the workers are as close to the bone as they can get. I am going to be no party in this Conference for one moment to admitting either by inference or in any

THE WORKERS' ADVOCATE

other way that the working classes have anything further to spare to contribute to a solution of our present economic difficulties. They have been driven down both on their social services and on their wages during the last two years. They have made their contribution in advance, and therefore the standard of living as expressed by wages must be maintained.

My last word is this. Mr. Forbes Watson, the British employers' representative, said in his speech: "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." Yes, but that sickness may take a course that is very bad for Western civilization; and a negative attitude is after all a provocative attitude. A negative attitude means that the workers are driven to despair because there is no response to their request to try and get them out of the economic morass which they now find themselves in through no fault of their own; and I would answer the proverb of Mr. Forbes Watson by another couplet:—

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay."

—*Oliver Goldsmith*

SOURCES

SOURCES

CHAPTER 1

- Speech* Transport & General Workers' Union Biennial Delegate Conference, Llandudno. August 18, 1941.
Broadcast To America. Labor Day, 1941.

CHAPTER 2

- Speech* Rotary Club, London. November 20, 1940.
Speech Bristol. October 26, 1940.
Speech Lancashire & Cheshire Federation of Trades Councils, Manchester. October 12, 1940.
Speech Drapers' Chamber of Trade, London. March 26, 1941.
Speech Foreign Press Association, London. December 20, 1940.
Speech Printers' Pension Fund, London. December 10, 1940.
Speech Rotary Club, London. November 20, 1940.
Speech Trade Union delegates, Cardiff. November 23, 1940.
Speech Cardiff Business Club. November 23, 1940.
Broadcast To Australia. February 17, 1941.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

- Speech* Edinburgh. December 14, 1940.
Speech Anglo-American Chamber of Commerce. June 13, 1940.
Speech Bristol. October 26, 1940.

CHAPTER 3

- Speech* Special Conference of Trade Union Executives, London. May 25, 1940.

CHAPTER 4

- Speech* Trade Union delegates, Cardiff. November 23, 1940.
Speech Scottish Trade Union delegates, Glasgow. December 15, 1940.
Speech Scottish Trade Union delegates, Edinburgh. December 14, 1940.
Speech Cardiff Business Club. November 23, 1940.
Speech Trade Union delegates, Cardiff. November 23, 1940.
Broadcast June 22, 1940.
Speech Cardiff Business Club. November 23, 1940.
Speech Edinburgh. December 14, 1940.
Speech Cardiff Business Club. November 23, 1940.

CHAPTER 5

- Broadcast* May 25, 1940.
Speech Drapers' Chamber of Trade, London. March 26, 1941.
Speech Lancashire & Cheshire Federation of Trades Councils, Manchester. October 12, 1940.
Broadcast To U.S.A. and Canada. April 26, 1941.
Speech House of Commons. April 2, 1941.

SOURCES

CHAPTER 6

- Speech* Lancashire & Cheshire Federation of Trades Councils, Manchester. October 12, 1940.
- Speech* Trade Union delegates, Cardiff. November 23, 1940.
- Speech* Lancashire & Cheshire Federation of Trades Councils, Manchester. October 12, 1940.
- Speech* Works Management Association, London. September 18, 1940.
- Speech* Lancashire & Cheshire Federation of Trades Councils, Manchester. October 12, 1940.
- Speech* Works Management Association, London. September 18, 1940.
- Speech* Scottish Trade Union delegates, Edinburgh. December 14, 1940.
- Speech* Works Management Association, London. September 18, 1940.
- Speech* Works Management Association, Birmingham. April 19, 1941.
- Speech* Scottish Trade Union delegates, Edinburgh. December 14, 1940.
- Speech* Works Management Association, London. September 18, 1940.
- Speech* Scottish Trade Union delegates, Edinburgh. December 14, 1940.
- Speech* Lancashire & Cheshire Federation of Trade Councils, Manchester. October 12, 1940.
- Speech* Glasgow. December 15, 1940.
- Speech* Works Management Association, Birmingham. April 19, 1941.
- Speech* Glasgow. December 15, 1940.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

CHAPTER 7

- Speech* Anglo-American Chamber of Commerce, London.
June 13. 1940.
- Speech* Lancashire & Cheshire Federation of Trades Coun-
cils. October 12, 1940.
- Speech* Trade Union Congress, Southport. October 9, 1940.
- Broadcast* To North America. June 3, 1941.
- Speech* Bristol. October 26, 1940.
- Speech* Glasgow. December 15, 1940.
- Broadcast* December 15, 1940.
- Speech* Trade Union Congress, Southport. October 9, 1940.

CHAPTER 8

- Speech* Glasgow. December 15, 1940.
- Speech* Bristol. October 26, 1940.
- Broadcast* October 12, 1940.
- Speech* Trade Union delegates, Cardiff. November 23, 1940.
- Broadcast* To Australia. February 17, 1941.
- Speech* Drapers' Chamber of Trade. March 26, 1941.
- Broadcast* Bristol. October 26, 1940.
- Broadcast* To Australia. February 17, 1941.
- Broadcast* To Canada. February 16, 1941.
- Speech* Works Management Association, London. Septem-
ber 18, 1940.
- Speech* Printers' Pension Fund. December 16, 1940.
- Broadcast* June 23, 1940.
- Speech* Foreign Press Association. December 20, 1940.
- Speech* Glasgow. December 15, 1940.

SOURCES

- Broadcast* To America and Overseas. May 25, 1940.
Broadcast October 26, 1940.
Broadcast To U.S.A. April 25, 1941.
Broadcast To North America. November 23, 1940.
Speech Edinburgh. December 14, 1940.

CHAPTER 9

- Speech* Scottish Trade Union delegates, Glasgow. December 15, 1940.
Speech Foreign Press Association. December 20, 1940.
Broadcast To North America. November 23, 1940.
Speech Scottish Trade Union delegates, Edinburgh. December 14, 1940.
Speech Bristol. October 26, 1940.
Speech Scottish Trade Union delegates, Glasgow. December 15, 1940.
Speech Bristol. October 26, 1940.
Speech Foreign Press Association, London. December 20, 1940.
Speech Trade Union Congress, Southport. October 9, 1940.
Speech Anglo-American Chamber of Commerce, London. June 6, 1940.

CHAPTER 10

- Speech* Foreign Press Association, London. December 20, 1940.
Speech Trade Union delegates, Cardiff. November 23, 1940.
Speech Opening of the Polishing Employment Exchange. January 16, 1941.
Broadcast May Day, 1941.

THE BALANCE SHEET OF THE FUTURE

- Speech* Scottish Trade Union delegates, Edinburgh. December 15, 1940.
- Speech* Trade Union Congress, Southport. October 9, 1940.
- Speech* Scottish Trade Union delegates, Edinburgh. December 15, 1940.
- Broadcast* June 23, 1940.
- Broadcast* To Canada. February 16, 1941.
- Broadcast* To Australia. September 11, 1940.
- Broadcast* To North America. November 23, 1940.

CHAPTER 11

- Speech* Convocation of the Teachers College of New York. August 1939.

CHAPTER 12

- Speech* Executive Officials, Transport and General Workers' Union. February 1940.

CHAPTER 13

- Speech* Extracts of evidence given before the Court of Inquiry into working conditions and wages of Transport Workers (Dockers) 1920. Tripartite Preparatory Conference of the International Labor office, Geneva. January 18, 1933.

CHAPTER 14

- Broadcast* January 30, 1934.

CHAPTER 15

- Speech* Trade Union Congress. 1937.
- Speech* Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1938.
- Article* *The Spectator*. February 3, 1939.

SOURCES

CHAPTER 16

Speech The Section of Medical Sociology at the Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association, Belfast. 1937.

CHAPTER 17

Speech Oxford Management Conference. April 1940.

4
23/5